THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CCXXV.] SEPTEMBER, 1863. [Vol. XIX.

THE FIVE GREAT MONARCHIES OF THE ANCIENT EASTERN WORLD.*

Mr. Rawlinson observes with great truth, that the history of antiquity requires from time to time to be re-written, as the discoveries of travellers and the researches of archæologists bring new facts to light, or throw new light upon facts known before. If this is the case with regard to histories resting on documents and monuments long since known—and the constant appearance of new histories of Greece and Rome proves that it is so—much more must it be true of countries whose monuments have till lately been unknown, and of whose language the past generations of historical inquirers were profoundly ignorant. Such has been the condition of the countries whose history Mr. Rawlinson has undertaken to illustrate. His volumes, he says, "aim at accomplishing for the Five Nations of which they treat, what Movers and Kenrick have accomplished for Phœnicia, or (still more exactly) what Wilkinson has accomplished for Ancient Egypt. Assuming the interpretation of the historical inscriptions as in general sufficiently established, and the various ancient remains as assigned on sufficient grounds to certain peoples and epochs, they seek to unite with our previous knowledge of the five nations, whether derived from biblical or classical sources, the new information obtained from modern discovery." It is indeed not only true that the history of these nations requires at the present moment to be re-written, but we may venture to predict that it can only be provisional, and will require to be modified by further researches. So much, however, has been accomplished, that the time has come when a comprehensive survey of what is actually known is very welcome to the historical student. A future age will in its turn provide for its own wants.

Professor Rawlinson has enjoyed a great advantage in his work from being able to command the services of his accomplished brother, Sir Henry Rawlinson. Mr. Vaux, of the British Museum, has placed at his disposal the entire series of unpub-

* The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World, or the History, Geography and Antiquities of Chaldæa, Assyria, Babylon, Media and Persia, collected and illustrated from Ancient and Modern Sources. By George Rawlinson, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford, late Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College. In Three Volumes. Vol. I. Pp. 501.

lished drawings made by the artists who accompanied Mr. Loftus in the last Mesopotamian expedition, the results of which are little known to the public. His work is profusely illustrated from this source, as well as from the published drawings of Botta, Flandin and Layard. We can congratulate him on having found a more legitimate field for the employment of the knowledge which he has accumulated, than his translation of Herodotus. In that work, adopting the principle of illustrating his author by bringing together all that has come to light since he wrote, whether bearing on his text or not, he has buried the Father of History under a mound of learned but irrelevant commentary. Possibly some purchasers of that costly work may complain, when they find how much of it they have to purchase again, if they possess themselves of this new history.

The present volume contains the history of the first of the five monarchies, the Chaldæan, as Professor Rawlinson calls it, and the commencement of the Assyrian. We shall confine our remarks to the first part.

The very title which this monarchy bears introduces us to debateable ground. The name Chaldæan has been generally supposed to belong only to a late period of Babylonian history, and to a geographical position the most remote from Lower Mesopotamia. Xenophon (Anab. iv. 3, 4) speaks of the Chaldæans as an independent and warlike people, neighbours of the Armenians; and elsewhere as mercenaries, serving in the army of the elder Cyrus. Strabo (xii. 548) places them in nearly the same locality, and says they were the same people who were originally called Chalybes; though he also recognizes the name as belonging to Lower Mesopotamia in his own time (xvi. 739). With the single exception that the place whence Abram migrated is called in Genesis, "Ur of the Chaldees," the name does not occur in Scripture history, till the time when the sacred writers begin to threaten the Jews with punishment by means of the Babylonians, of whose armies they were the most warlike part. And it is remarkable that they are not spoken of then as composing the most ancient of all the monarchies of the East, but as a people who had recently sprung into political existence. It was among the humiliations of Tyre, according to Isaiah (xxiii. 13), that her palaces should be laid bare, and she should be made a ruin, by the Chaldæans,—a people *that was not* till established by Assyria. In Job, too, with an uncertain date, they appear as a nomadic and predatory people. Nowhere in Scripture is there any trace of a Chaldæan kingdom till, owing to the preponderance of the Chaldæan element in the population, it is used as a synonym for Babylonian. In later times, as in those of the book of Daniel, it occurs either in the sense of astrologers, or (ix. 1) to denote the Babylonian empire overthrown by Darius. In the Græco-Roman times, the name is confined to Lower

Mesopotamia, including the site of ancient Babylon. Berosus, writing in the reign of Alexander the Great, gives the Babylonian people from the first the name of Chaldæans; but this will not bear the stress which Professor Rawlinson lays upon it, since we have seen that for several centuries before Alexander, Chaldæa had become equivalent to Babylonia. When Berosus places a Chaldæan dynasty at the commencement of his human history, no more can be inferred from it, than that he considered the country, *then known* as Chaldæa, to be the primeval seat of the people who had made Babylon their capital. From this region, reaching to the head of the Persian Gulf, the history of the civilization, the arts and sciences and the religion of the people originated. Ancient ethnology soon reached its terminus in an indigenous population, whose origin was the same as that of the human race.

The results of Assyrian research have enriched the principal museums of Europe—our own in a pre-eminent degree; and many scholars have employed themselves in deciphering the monuments and building up the information derived from them into a temporary structure of history. Little notice, however, has been bestowed on the results of two expeditions made by Mr. Loftus—the first set on foot by individuals, the second by government—for the exploration of the antiquities of Lower Mesopotamia. Professor Rawlinson, we believe, is the first who has employed the materials collected in these two expeditions for the construction of a regular history; and though we may differ from him on several points, we gladly acknowledge the obligation which he has conferred on historical inquirers by laying a number of new and curious facts before them.

The country which he includes in his Chaldæan kingdom begins about N. lat. 34°, where a slightly elevated district of secondary limestone gives place to an alluvial plain, which continues to the head of the Persian Gulf. During how many ages before the commencement of history, the two mighty rivers, Tigris and Euphrates, have been at work, creating this region by their deposits, we do not venture to guess. There is reason to believe that the present rate of increase is rapid, amounting, it is said, to a mile in seventy years; but more accurate data are required before we can safely carry back our calculations into past ages. Professor Rawlinson thinks that Ur or Hur in N. lat. 31° may have been a seaport at the mouth of the Euphrates, at the commencement of Chaldæan history, though now upwards of 100 miles from the sea.

The history of the human race after the deluge, according to the book of Genesis, began in this alluvial region. "The sons of Ham were Cush and Mizraim and Phut and Canaan—and Cush begat Nimrod; he began to be a mighty one in the earth —and the beginning of his kingdom was Babel and Erech and

Accad and Calneh in the land of Shinar. Out of that land he went forth into Assyria* and builded Nineveh," &c. (Gen. x. 6). That this was the first great monarchy on the earth, of which the Jews had any knowledge, and that its seat was in Babylonia, and that Nineveh and its empire were derived from it, is evident from this passage. But whence came Nimrod, the son of Cush, the founder of this monarchy and remotely of the Assyrian?

Without insisting on the distinction between Elohistic and Jehovistic documents in the book of Genesis, we think there are evident marks of the author's having used various sources of history, without thinking it necessary to make them consistent with each other. We have reason to rejoice that he has done so; a more artificial treatment, in the modern fashion of combining and reconciling, might have obliterated the traces of truth. The founder of the Babylonian kingdom is removed by three generations only from Noah, whose family of eight persons had been left on the mountains of Armenia, with a world recently immersed for a twelvemonth, in which to establish themselves. Would any one, writing a continuous history, have transported a branch of the family from Ararat to the head of the Persian Gulf, without notice of any intermediate event? Besides, in the 11th chapter, where the settlement of the plain of Babylonia is described, the settlers are represented as coming from the East,—not the course, surely, by which Noah's descendants would have travelled from the region in which the narrative of the Deluge leaves them. The legends betray a separate origin, one being designed to account for the marks of diluvial action on the earth's surface, the other for the origin of the varieties of language. And the compiler of the book of Genesis has incorporated them in his narrative as he found them, perhaps without perceiving, certainly without attempting to conceal, their inconsistency.

As the notion of *autochthones* is banished from history, Professor Rawlinson's first step, after describing very fully and clearly the geography and productions of the country which is the seat of his Chaldæan empire, is to inquire into the ethnological affinities and relations of the people. The name of Chaldæan would seem to settle the question. We have considerable remains of the Chaldee language; it differs only dialectically from the Hebrew and the other Semitic languages. It has naturally been taken for granted therefore that the Chaldæans spoke Chaldee. Further, the Babylonian language of the age of Nebuchadnezzar, when the kingdom was emphatically Chaldæan, was Semitic, and even more closely allied to Hebrew than the Chaldee of Daniel and the Targums.† But the book of Genesis, according to Pro-

* See the Revised Translation. In the Common Version it is "went forth Asshur."

† Rawlinson, p. 56.

fessor Rawlinson, does not allow us to believe this; and the monuments of Lower Babylonia, recently brought to light, shew, he says, the language not to have been Semitic. Nimrod, the founder of the monarchy, is a son of Cush, the son of Ham; the people over whom he ruled belong, therefore, to the same family as the Egyptians and the Ethiopians. We lay little stress upon such genealogies. Considering how ignorant the ancients were of comparative philology, in ages of far deeper reflection and more extensive knowledge, than that in which the book of Genesis had its origin, we think it highly improbable that the earliest ethnology should have been founded on linguistic affinities. Colour, on the other hand, is a striking difference, and much more likely to give origin to ethnological classification. *Ham* signifies, like the Greek Αἰθίοψ, the *adust*, and to Ham as a progenitor are referred the dark-coloured races, Egyptians, Ethiopians, Babylonians, Canaanites, and Arabs of the southern country. It has indeed been suggested that the Canaanites, though Shemites, have been placed in the list of Ham's descendants in order to bring them under the operation of the curse, and justify their subjugation by the descendants of Shem, on whom the blessing rested; but we think it probable that they were really allied in physiological peculiarity to the dark races of Egypt and Ethiopia. The traditions of Genesis, therefore, are in accordance with those of profane antiquity, which not only place eastern and western Ethiopians along the shores of the Persian Gulf, but make Susiana, the region which adjoins the head of the Gulf, the seat of the monarchy of Memnon, the Ethiopian, and speak of Ethiopians on the coast of Palestine.

According to Professor Rawlinson's view, however, which requires that all Ham's descendants should speak a kindred language, the people who formed his first empire under Nimrod must be shewn to have used a language allied to the Egyptian. For this purpose he calls to his aid the discoveries made by Mr. Loftus in Lower Babylonia, or Chaldæa Proper. In the mounds of mouldering brick which mark the sites of its ancient cities, monuments have been found, containing examples of a language differing greatly from the later Babylonian. In its grammatical structure it resembles dialects of the Turanian family, but its vocabulary is "decidedly Cushite or Ethiopian." For the evidence of this statement we are referred to Sir Henry Rawlinson, whose Essay, in his brother's translation of Herodotus, is reproduced and expanded in the present work. Now, with all respect for the learning of Sir Henry and gratitude for his services, we hesitate to accept his dictum respecting the affinities of this newly-found language. We remember how much of his original opinions respecting the Assyrian inscriptions he has had to revoke, and without seeing a grammar and vocabulary of this old Chaldæan, we must be allowed to suspend our faith. His

account, too, is bad for vagueness. Turanian is a name originally only negative, denoting what was not Aryan; in the sense which modern philologists have given to it, it has no monuments to serve as an instrument of comparison. Cushite is equally vague, as descriptive of a family of languages. Of the language of those whom the Greeks called Ethiopians and the Hebrews Cush, we have no ancient remains, except the version of the Scriptures and a few other things all of post-Christian times. But this language is decidedly Semitic, and so are the dialects now in use in Abyssinia. On the strength of the Hamite descent of Nimrod, Professor Rawlinson, it will be remembered, makes the Chaldæan people to belong to the Egyptian as well as the Ethiopian family. The Egyptian language is not so purely Semitic as the Ethiopian; but to call its other element Turanian, is to use a word with no definite meaning. The proof, therefore, of the non-Semitic character of Nimrod's people, as far as language is concerned, is very doubtful—indeed it rather turns against our author. He says, that "in the earliest times to which we can go back, Chaldæa seems to have been inhabited by four principal tribes, whose languages belonged to the four great varieties of human speech, the Hamitic, Semitic, Aryan and Turanian." This is assumed without any other evidence, than that words may be picked out, which seem in form and signification to correspond with Turkish, Tatar, Magyar, Coptic, Sanscrit, Abyssinian, Greek. But if the people were so heterogeneous in the earliest known times, how idle is all speculation on the affinities of the companions of Nimrod!

The memorials discovered in the ruined cities of Lower Babylonia have furnished Sir Henry Rawlinson with a scheme of its history which his brother has adopted. By a calculation founded on the Bavian inscription and the Shergat cylinders, he fixes the reign of a king Ismi-dagon to the year 1861 B.C., and the commencement of the historical, as distinguished from the mythical, chronology of Chaldæa to 2234 B.C. This will correspond with the alleged commencement of the astronomical observations of the Chaldæans. The reader who remembers that according to the orthodox chronology this is a little more than a century from the time when "the whole earth began to be overspread" by the descendants of Noah's three sons, will be able to judge of the probability of the commencement of records of "stellar observations" at this early age.*

The recent explorations of Lower Babylonia have rendered it

* If Professor Rawlinson could have reconciled himself to the admission of a legend into Bible history, he might have found a confirmation of his opinion of the early cultivation of astronomy among the Chaldæans, in the account of the building of the tower of Babel, which we have little doubt, in its primary meaning, was a rebuke to the curiosity of those who endeavoured, by observation of the heavenly bodies, to raise themselves to a level with divinity. The language

probable that the beginning of the monarchy was from the south, not from the north. The sites of some of the cities mentioned in Genesis have been identified with considerable evidence. Ellasar, of which Arioch (Gen. xiv. 1) was king, appears to be Lassa; Erech (Gen. x. 10), Warka. Ur is referred by Professor Rawlinson to Hur or Mugheir, a town on the right bank of the Euphrates, and, as he supposes, in early times near its mouth. Following out his own view, that this was the early seat of the Chaldæan people, he considers this to be the "Ur of the Chaldees," from which Abraham migrated into Canaan. If this be correct, all our ideas of the course of the patriarch's travels must be changed. Instead of descending from northern Mesopotamia, the site of the Ur spoken of by Ammianus Marcellinus, he must have come from the head of the Persian Gulf. In that case, what should bring him, on his way to Canaan, from lat. 31°, to Haran in lat. 37°? Abraham is said to have dwelt on the *other side* of the Euphrates (Josh. xxiv. 2); but Hur, on Professor Rawlinson's map, is on the *western* side of that river. We must demur, therefore, to this new position of Abraham's dwelling-place, though the writer of the article Ur, in Dr. William Smith's Geography, says it has been demonstrated by Sir H. Rawlinson.

From the specimens of the writing of the ancient inhabitants of this region, preserved on cylinders or tablets of clay, it appears to have belonged to the same class, the cuneiform, which with modifications was used by all the five nations, whose history Professor Rawlinson has undertaken to write. In its earliest form it is said to bear marks of being pictorial, not phonetic. A few historical names and facts have been gleaned from the interpretation of it. The dynasty of Nimrod is supposed to have reigned for two centuries and a half. The name of a king Urukh has been found on many monuments, proving him to have been, like Hadrian, a great architect; and as Ovid (Met. iv. 212) mentions

---

in which Ovid describes the founders of astronomical science, closely resembles that which the narrative in Genesis uses of the builders of Babel. Fasti, i. 297:

"Felices animos, quibus hæc cognoscere primis
Inque domos superas scandere cura fuit.
Admovere oculis distantia sidera terris,
Ætheraque ingenio supposuere suo.
Sic potitur cœlum; non ut ferat Ossan Olympus,
Summaque Peliacus sidera tanget apex."

As the legend now stands in Genesis, there is no congruity in it. There was no need that a tower should be built *that should reach to heaven*, in order to prevent the people from being scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth; nor any reason why Jehovah should be apprehensive that "nothing should be restrained from them which they have imagined to do," merely because they had built a city and a tower. The legend appears to have been diverted from its original purpose, to afford an etymology, which after all is fanciful, of the name Babel. The early cultivation of astronomy in Chaldæa appears to be indicated also by the identification of Nimrod with the constellation Orion, "the mighty hunter," who had boasted, "Quam nequeam, dixit, vincere nulla fera est." Ov. Fasti, v. 540.

Orchamus as seventh from Belus, he is supposed to be Urukh, and Urukh seventh from Nimrod. Urukh is supposed to have been succeeded by his son Ilgi. A change of dynasty is then assumed, which raised to the throne the Elamite Chedorlaomer, mentioned in Genesis (ch. xiv.) as engaged with three other kings in attacking Abraham, then dwelling at Bethel. The Chedorlaomer of Genesis is supposed to be the Kudur-mabuk whose name has been found on some bricks at Mugheir, although his title of king of Elam (the royal title being given also to the rulers of Shinar and Ellasar) concludes strongly against the notion of a monarchy in Chaldæa. From him we pass to the great Ismidagon, placed about 1860 B.C., who appears to have extended his dominion into Assyria. Many other names, which it is impossible to arrange or connect with any known history, occur; and about 1500 years before Christ, the ancient Chaldæans, the stock of Cush and people of Nimrod, sunk into comparative obscurity, being gradually Semitized by Arabian and Assyrian influences, till in 625 B.C. they regained their independence, and founded what we call the Babylonian monarchy. Such is the scheme which the Professor and his brother have constructed.

If it be now inquired what *real* accession of historical knowledge we have obtained from the exploration of Lower Babylonia, we may reply, that the account of Scripture, which represents the civilization of the valley of the Euphrates as beginning at the southern end, has been confirmed. The writing, the mythology, the art of this region, have all an archaic character, compared with those of Assyria and the later Babylonia. The tools which are found are of flint or bronze: iron is unknown in the earliest times, and when it makes its appearance it is as a *precious* metal, used for bangles and rings. The early prevalence of idolatry in the land beyond the Euphrates is also fully attested by these remains, as well as that astral character, which all ancient testimony attributes to the Chaldæan religion. The necessity for an early separation of a monotheistic people, like the descendants of Abraham, from this mass of idolaters, is placed in a strong point of view—stronger, indeed, if we accept Professor Rawlinson's locality for "Ur of the Chaldees," than upon the common interpretation. We gain, too, a point on the shore of the Persian Gulf, to or from which, as further research may determine, the civilization of India and Egypt may have spread. These results are valuable, however uncertain the chronology may be which Professor Rawlinson has connected with them.

K.

BIBLIOLATRY.*

The Christian religion is a gift to the whole human race, and we trust that it will ultimately prevail over all the earth. It stands alone, and is independent of all other dispensations. It is not founded on Judaism, and Judaism is no part of it. It is found in the New Testament, and there only. The authority of the earlier religion given by the Almighty to the Israelites is acknowledged by Jesus Christ, and therefore we are bound to admit it to be from God. Our Saviour recognizes the Law and the Prophets as of divine origin; but to how much of the Old Testament this recognition applies, it is not easy to say. He certainly nowhere says that all the books of the Old Testament are of divine authority; and he censures with extreme severity the Scribes and Pharisees as corrupters of the religion of Moses. What are the genuine Law and the Prophets is matter of interesting inquiry, but it forms no part of our religion as Gentile Christians. Whether the religion of the Jews is abolished, or whether they are to be restored to the Holy Land, and to be kept a separate nation, still subject to their old law in some shape or other, is no direct concern of ours. The preservation of the nationality of the Jews for more than eighteen centuries, under unexampled persecutions, seems to indicate that they will be again gathered together as an independent nation; but when it is considered that they consist only of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, probably the larger portion of the tribe of Levi, and perhaps of some individuals of the other tribes, and that the bulk of the ten tribes are apparently irrecoverably mixed with other nations, many are led to suppose that the like amalgamation of the Jews will take place on their conversion to Christianity, and that the ancient dispensation will be entirely done away. We have, however, no ground for a confident opinion on either side of this question, nor would a satisfactory solution of it affect at all any duty incumbent on us as Christians. It is enough for us that Christianity is quite independent of Judaism.

As, however, it cannot be denied that a very great majority of the Christian world consider the Old Testament of equal authority with the New, and that we are bound to yield obedience to the moral laws of Moses,—that in discussions on the subjects of marriage and divorce, the Levitical law is referred to as of authority,—and that the Ten Commandments are generally recognized as a most important part of the Christian religion,—we feel ourselves bound to set forth the grounds of our opinion that Christianity is found in the teachings of our Saviour and his disciples, and there only. When, in the end of the Gospel of Matthew, the apostles are commanded by Jesus to teach all

---

* Continued from p. 431.

nations, he adds, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded." Not a word about the former dispensation. We do not find that he anywhere speaks of Judaism in any other manner than as a dispensation preparatory to his kingdom. Christianity was not complete in his lifetime, and it could only be established by his death and resurrection. He was a Jew, and lived with and taught Jews. He therefore complied with the Jewish law and acknowledged its authority; but nowhere does he intimate that the Gentiles were to be brought under the yoke of the Jewish law. In the passage quoted above, therefore, there can be no reference to that law.

But it will be said, are not the Ten Commandments referred to as binding on Christians in the Catechism of the Church of England, and placed on the walls of their churches, and read as parts of their services? Are they not admitted as of divine authority by Christians in general? And have not even the Unitarians acknowledged their authority by including them in the Liturgies used in the Essex-Street and Little Portland-Street chapels? Undoubtedly these things are so; but we shall endeavour to shew that there is no scriptural authority in support of their being so considered. No doubt they were of divine authority to those to whom they were delivered, and may perhaps be so still to the Jews; but we have a higher law under which we live. As to the Unitarians having adopted them, the manner in which they have been introduced into their liturgy proves clearly to our minds that they ought not to have been there at all. They are introduced by the words, "God spake to the children of Israel;" the address at the end of each commandment in the Common Prayer, praying the Almighty to "incline our hearts to keep this law," is omitted; and after the Ten Commandments, the two great Christian Commandments, the love of God and of our neighbour, are introduced; and then the congregation pray to God that they may keep his laws. We do not feel that we are making a bold assertion when we say that we are fully convinced that not a single Unitarian minister believes the whole of the Ten Commandments to be binding on Christians, and not a few of the clergy of the established religion deny the Jewish Sabbath being in any sense obligatory on Christians. We cannot doubt that in any future edition of the Essex-Street Liturgy the Ten Commandments will be omitted. The introduction of what our Saviour calls the first and second commandments shews the uselessness of what has preceded it. What need can we have, who are commanded to love our neighbour as ourselves, of particular laws forbidding murder and adultery? Christianity consists not in the letter, but in the spirit, and its whole tenor forbids us to commit any injury whatever to our fellow-creatures.

The Christian religion was first preached to the Gentiles by

the apostle Peter, Acts x. On that occasion he burst the narrow bounds of Judaism and said, vers. 34, 35, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." He then proceeds to instruct them, setting forth the divine authority of Jesus Christ, but not saying a word to shew that the Gentiles were to adopt Judaism as a part of their religion.

But although St. Peter was the first apostle who preached the gospel to the Gentiles, the appellation of the Apostle to the Gentiles is usually and properly given to St. Paul, who "laboured more abundantly than they all" in the conversion of the heathen, and in the establishment of Christian churches among them. No one can have read attentively the Epistles of that great and admirable promulgator of the Christian faith without being aware that he repeatedly declares the freedom of the Gentiles from the religion of the Jews. A few passages will suffice for our purpose. 2 Cor. iii. 6—11: "Who (God) also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: how shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which was done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious." Observe that he speaks of the dispensation by Moses to be "done away," and that it actually was done away.

Galatians ii. 11—14: "But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" Here we find St. Paul rebuking St. Peter, who had taken the most prominent part among the apostles, for impliedly endeavouring to bring the Gentiles into subjection to the Jews. Nothing shews more clearly how difficult it was to induce the Jews to acknowledge the equality of the Gentiles as to religious privi-

leges and advantages with themselves than the conduct of Peter and Barnabas at this time.

We will quote another passage from St. Paul's Epistles, which clearly shews that the Jewish Sabbath is not binding on Christians, and which is quite inconsistent with a notion, very generally entertained, of the substitution of Sunday for Saturday, for which there is not the slightest foundation in the New Testament. Coloss. ii. 16, 17: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of the new moon, or of the sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ."

Thinking, then, that we have established the independence of Christianity on Judaism, and shewn that the New Testatment contains all that is essential to the religion of Jesus Christ, we will now proceed to shew how unfounded is the apprehension of injury to Christianity which many believe will follow from giving up the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the whole Bible.

Let us not, however, be understood to speak lightly of the Old Testament; on the contrary, we believe it to contain much which is of divine authority. We fully admit that the law of Moses was a dispensation of the Almighty, most important in itself, and a necessary preparation to the religion of Christ. We esteem it worthy of the most serious perusal of all Christians. The loss of the Psalms, which are properly read and sung in all Christian churches, would be irreparable. In the wonderful book of Job we find the most sublime and pathetic outpourings of a religious spirit. The prophets are admirable teachers of religious duty, and their works combine the highest beauties of poetry with the profoundest feelings of devotion. The Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus are marked by great knowledge of the human heart, and contain admirable maxims for the conduct of life; and many of the persons in the Old Testament, Abraham, Moses, Samuel, &c., give some of the finest examples of religion and virtue which history affords us. Still we find nowhere in the earlier and preparatory dispensation anything equal to the instructions of our Saviour and his apostles. The book of Deuteronomy contains what Jesus calls the first and great commandment; but the second, the love of our neighbour, the law of universal benevolence, we do not find anywhere in the Old Testament. If that book, or rather collection of books, were destroyed, and future nations could be made acquainted with the New Testament, and the historical records which, in connection with the internal evidence of its heavenly origin, form the grounds of our belief, these would afford satisfactory reasons for our receiving the Christian religion as coming from God, and making it the rule of our lives in this world, and the foundation of our hopes for the world to come.

For the illustration of our argument, we will again revert to

the supposed case of a believer and an unbeliever being engaged in the study of the Old Testament with a view to the question of its plenary inspiration. With the unbeliever we have nothing more to do; and we will proceed to set forth what would be the probable result of the inquiry of the believer, and which we think we have satisfactory reason to believe such an inquiry has produced on the minds of many sincere and pious Christians. It is obvious that, within the limits which can be here given to this article, it is impossible to state and weigh the arguments which have been and may be advanced in favour of and against the conclusions to which we assume the inquirer to have arrived. We shall merely state probable results, and then proceed to consider whether they would be calculated to destroy, or in any degree to weaken his belief in the divine authority of the Christian religion.

The inquirer, then, would entirely reject the doctrine of the inspiration of every word of the Old Testament. With respect to the Pentateuch, he would find no sufficient reason to believe that it was written by Moses; he would think that a large portion of it is of very great antiquity, and that the accounts of the early patriarchs, of the call of Abraham, and of his life, and those of Isaac and Jacob, of Joseph's being sold into Egypt, of the course of his life in that country, of Jacob and his family going down to Egypt, of the Israelites leaving Egypt, of their sojourning in the wilderness, and of their settlement in the land of Canaan, contain, in the main, a credible history of the Israelites, as satisfactory as we can reasonably expect the early history of any nation to be; but he would see no reason to believe that, unlike all other early histories, it is free from errors, and he finds inconsistencies in some parts of it, and things incredible in others. With respect to the accounts of the creation, he can discern no satisfactory ground for thinking that they are inspired; he cannot reconcile the first with the second chapter of Genesis. It seems to him clear that the book of Genesis is composed of portions written by different authors, some parts of which are inconsistent with others, and some of which seem to have rather the character of pictorial representations than of recorded facts. In common with many of the most learned and intelligent divines, he thinks that the numbers of the Israelites must be greatly exaggerated; and he can find no satisfactory chronology in the book of Genesis.

With respect to some things mentioned as facts, he finds it impossible to admit their truth. He can discover no rational ground for believing that Balaam's ass spoke, or that the sun stood still to give Joshua more time to destroy the Amorites. He thinks that the story of Samson has a fabulous appearance. Let us consider the grounds of this opinion. The history of this extraordinary person represents him to possess a degree of bodily

strength which we may properly call miraculous. His first memorable exploit is killing a young lion, and is narrated in the following words, Judges xiv. 5, 6: "A young lion roared against him. And the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him, and he rent him as he would have rent a kid, and he had nothing in his hand." Here there is a positive assertion of miraculous power. In the 19th verse of the same chapter he is directed by the Spirit of the Lord to slay thirty men at Ashkelon. In chap. xv. 4, 5, an act of almost incredible wickedness is said to have been perpetrated by Samson: "And Samson went and caught three hundred foxes, and took firebrands, and turned tail to tail, and put a firebrand in the midst between two tails. And when he had set the brands on fire, he let them go into the standing corn of the Philistines, and burnt up both the shocks and also the standing corn, with the vineyards and olives." Every reader of the slightest reflection will see the incredibility of this story. It is obvious that this supposed fact could not have been done by Samson alone, and that it would take a considerable time to complete the transaction; but not a word does the narrative give us of Samson having any one to assist him in this nefarious business. And what could the Philistines, the masters of the country at the time, have been about, that they did not interfere to prevent this destruction of their property? The next exploit of Samson is killing a thousand men with the jaw-bone of an ass. His next feat is to take the doors of the gate of the city of Gaza and the two posts upon his shoulders, and to carry them to the top of a hill. In the concluding scene of his life, when he was a prisoner in the hands of the Philistines and had been exposed by them to make sport, he lays hold of the main pillars of the temple of Dagon, in which he was exposed, and which is said to have been full of men and women, pulls them down, and thus destroys the temple and all the people in it, himself included. Now to those who are prepared to introduce a miracle into any part of the Bible history where they fancy that it is required, all this is very easy; but our inquirer is not so readily satisfied. He asks himself, before he can assent to the truth of these incredible stories, by whom and when was the book of Judges written. The answer is, that nobody knows. Thinking, then, that a book written nobody knows where or by whom can have no claim to divine authority, he feels no hesitation in treating this story of Samson as no more entitled to be believed than the labours of Hercules.

In other parts of the historical books of the Old Testament our inquirer finds contradictions, which shew that at least one account must be false. Thus it is said, 1 Kings xv. 33, that in the third year of Asa, king of Judah, Baasha began to reign over Israel twenty-four years, making the whole period when Asa ruled Judah and Baasha Israel twenty-seven years; but 2 Chron.

xvi. 1 says that in the six-and-thirtieth year of Asa, Baasha came up against Judah. We have already mentioned than in 2 Chron. xxii. Ahaziah is said to have been forty-two years old when he began to reign, which makes him two years older than his father. In the corresponding passage, 2 Kings viii. 26, Ahaziah is said to have been two-and-twenty years old when he began to reign.

We have already mentioned the incredible story in the Chronicles, that Abijah, king of Judah, with an army of four hundred thousand men, slew five hundred thousand men of the army of Israel. If this unprecedented slaughter really took place, it seems impossible to suppose that any one writing a history of these times could fail to notice particularly this battle, which stands alone in the history of the world. In the corresponding passage of 2 Kings xv. 7, all that is said is, "and there was war between Abijam and Jeroboam." It is hardly necessary to say that the person here called Abijam is the same who is called Abijah in Chronicles. A great exaggeration of numbers seems to run through the whole Israelitish history, prompted, no doubt, by the desire of the writers to exalt and magnify their nation. Among these our inquirer reckons the accounts contained both in Kings and Chronicles of Solomon having sacrificed two-and-twenty thousand oxen and one hundred and twenty thousand sheep at the dedication of the temple.

In the book of Job, in the Psalms, and in the Prophets, who were the great moral teachers of the people, our inquirer finds many noble and exalted sentiments respecting the Deity which every devout mind must highly prize, but which still do not fully come up to the exalted conceptions of God which are contained in the New Testament. In the Old Testament, God is a man of war, a Lord of hosts, who fights with and defeats the gods of the heathen, triumphs over them, and leads captivity captive. An antagonistic power seems to be admitted to exist in these false deities, which they exert in vain against the Almighty Jehovah. How superior to these views are those of the best-informed and most reflecting Christians, who believe that God is really omnipotent, and that no power in the universe can resist or delay the march of his providence; that his will absolutely governs all; and that he orders all things to work together for good to those who love and serve him! True indeed it is that much inconsistency prevails in the minds of many on this subject. Thus whatever nations are at war, neither side fails to claim the Deity as its ally. All their victories are ascribed, and truly, to him; but they seldom seem to see that the same Great Being who enabled them to conquer their enemies on one occasion, gave the like power to their enemies on another. They see that the Almighty gave the English the victories of Trafalgar and Waterloo, but seem to forget that he made the French the conquerors at Marengo and Austerlitz. To consider themselves

and their country as the peculiar favourites of God who rules over all, and whose providence extends to all, is the prevailing error of all nations.

With respect to the law of Moses, our inquirer meets with difficulties which are to him insuperable. Fully satisfied that Moses had divine authority to establish a religion among the Israelites, the basis of which was the belief in the Divine unity, and in which were contained fine conceptions of the character of God, though not, as we have endeavoured to shew, equally exalted and spiritual with those promulgated long afterwards by Christ and his apostles,—he finds it impossible to come to a satisfactory conclusion as to how much of the Pentateuch is to be taken as really the law of Moses. When he considers that the most burdensome rites and ceremonies are commanded to be observed in what is called the Levitical law,—that in the long record of the history of the Israelites which was before the captivity, there is very little which refers to those rites and ceremonies,—and when he comes to the remarkable event of the finding of the book of the law in the temple in the reign of Josiah, the consternation of that pious king on the perusal of the book, evinced by his remark, 2 Kings xxii. 13, "Great is the wrath of the Lord that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not hearkened to the words of this book, to do according unto all that is written concerning us,"—it seems clear to his mind that the king could not have been previously acquainted with the book of the law, and that the law of Moses must at that time have become merely traditional, or at most that some fragments of it alone could have been known to a king who excelled all that ever sat on the throne of his nation in purity and virtue; when he finds also that the book of Chronicles, which it seems now to be generally agreed was written after the return of the Jews from Babylon, contains far more about the priests and levites, and the rites and ceremonies in which they were engaged, than is to be found in the older historical books; and when he regards the fact that the kingly government was not again set up after the return of the Jews from the captivity, and that the priests possessed far higher authority in the new government than had ever fallen to their share in the times of the Kings; and when he adds to these facts that in many passages of the Psalms and the Prophets burnt-offerings and sacrifices are spoken of with great contempt,—the conviction forces itself on his mind, that the Pentateuch, in the form in which we now have it in our Bibles, did not exist under the monarchy of the Jews, but that much of it was written after the return from Babylon. When he finds from the discourses of our Saviour, from the way in which he speaks of the Sabbath, and especially from his most severe rebuke of the Scribes and Pharisees in the twenty-third chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, that the religion of Moses had been before

his time greatly corrupted, he cannot give any confidence to the existing Pentateuch as an authentic record of the original laws and institutions of Moses. This matter, however, he considers to belong exclusively to the Jews, and in no degree to affect our belief or our conduct as Christians.

We have now set forth what we think would be the result of a serious Christian's applying his mind to the study of the Old Testament with a sincere desire to arrive at the truth. With the correctness of those opinions we shall not concern ourselves. Volumes have been written, and many more will probably be written, on these difficult subjects, and different individuals will arrive at different conclusions concerning them. The question we have to ask of our readers is, whether there is any reasonable ground for the alarm which has been given to the minds of many serious and pious Christians by the publication of these and similar opinions, and whether they contain anything calculated to weaken our faith in the Christian religion, or in any degree to impede us in the performance of any Christian duty? To these questions we now proceed to give what seems to us satisfactory answers.

The great objects of the mission of Jesus Christ were the redemption of the human race from sin, and the punishment which awaits sinners, and the authoritative announcement of a future state of blessedness to those who believe in him and obey God's holy commandments. He inculcates piety to the Almighty, and universal benevolence to man, purity of heart and life, compassion, humility, and all that deserves the name of virtue. His instructions are given not as dry moral maxims, but with all the fervour of devotion to God, and of the deepest sympathy with man. No one possessed of any degree of devotion can read the 15th, 16th and 17th chapters of St. John's Gospel, without feeling that the character and teachings of Jesus are truly divine. The wisdom of man has added nothing to his instructions. The more deeply our moral nature has been studied, the more clearly has it been seen how admirably the instructions of the gospel are adapted to it. All our wishes for the improvement of the condition of man upon earth may be comprised in one, that Christianity may be embraced and may become the ruling principle of the whole human race.

And now we will ask, what is there in the opinions which we have set forth as those to which a serious inquirer may probably arrive as to the Old Testament, in any degree inconsistent with Christian faith and Christian practice? We unhesitatingly answer, Nothing. On the other hand, much which has tended to impede the march of Christianity has been the effect of an undue importance attributed by Christians to Judaism. A sabbatical character has been given to the Lord's-day by representing Sunday as an exchange for the Jewish Sabbath, for which supposed exchange

there is not the slightest authority in the New Testament. In imitation of the Jewish priests, Christian teachers, who are called in the New Testament ministers, elders and bishops, have been turned into priests,—a word never applied in the sacred book to Christian teachers; and these priests have assumed to themselves authority to dictate creeds to the laity, and have at length proceeded to what an enlightened future age will probably consider incredible presumption and profaneness, by including in the services of the Church a creed, now universally admitted to be a forgery, falsely ascribed to an eminent controversialist, but not written till at least two centuries after his death, containing unintelligible and contradictory dogmas, and audaciously and impiously denouncing damnation to those who do not believe them. In fact, Judaism and the Platonic philosophy have been the sources of most of the corruptions which have destroyed the beautiful simplicity of Christ's religion; for which have been substituted the unintelligible creeds and articles of fallible men, priestly authority over men's consciences, and rites and ceremonies unknown in the early ages of Christianity, and not enjoined in any part of the New Testament.

We have done with Bibliolatry, the worship of the letter of the Scriptures to the neglect of their spirit. It might be easily shewn that the same deplorable error has operated in full force on the New Testament, and led to the most appalling notions of the character of the Deity and the destination of man.

When will the happy time come when Christianity, cleared from all the unwarrantable additions by which the perverted ingenuity of man has encrusted and depraved it, shall shine forth in all its native beauty and effulgence, and become the joy of our hearts and the guide of our lives? Hasten, O heavenly Father, this glorious consummation! L.

CONTRASTS.

Near highest height the most profound abyss
Threatens th' adventurer. Misery's darkest den
Frowns nearest to the very gates of bliss;
And loudest thunders shake the mountains when
The summer season waxes strongest. Light
Shines brightest in the darkness of the night;
And stars disperse as dawns the day again.
Shade, sun—weal, woe—smiles, tears—this, only this,
Is the unvarying history of man;
Unchanging changes—fixed vicissitude—
All evil interblended with all good—
All good with evil—an entangled plan
Which is beyond the soul's unravelling powers:
But God is over all—creation's God and ours!

Louchon, July 19, 1863. John Bowring.

RENAN'S VIE DE JESUS.*

This is not a book to be lightly or high-handedly set aside. It must command the earnest and respectful attention of scholars and reasonable Christians in all countries of Europe at least.

Its author is well known beyond France, not only as perhaps the first orientalist in Europe and author of various works which bespeak such studies to be his *forte*,† but as the hero of the late theological difficulty respecting the Hebrew chair of the College of France.

His present theological position may be best learnt, we believe —but that will be somewhat vaguely—from the book before us. His special personal qualifications for illustrating the gospel narratives arise from his very fresh and intimate knowledge of the localities in which the events occurred. He was appointed head of the French scientific mission in 1860 and 1861 for exploring the monuments of ancient Phenicia; and his duties led him to reside on the frontiers of Galilee and to travel through it repeatedly. The report of his scientific mission is now in the press, but is not understood to contain many new or valuable results. Meanwhile he finds leisure to publish this *Life of Jesus*, which he wrote during his residence on Lebanon, and dedicates in a few touching sentences to his sister, who was his companion till he buried her at Byblos. He thus describes the effect of his travels in realizing to his mind the sacred history:

"I have traversed, in every sense of that word, the gospel district; I have visited Jerusalem, Hebron and Samaria; scarcely any locality of importance in the history of Jesus has escaped me. All that history which, at a distance, seems to float in the clouds of an unreal world, thus gained such form and solidity as astonished me. The striking correspondence of the records with the places, the wonderful harmony of the gospel idea with the landscape which served as its frame, were like a revelation to me. I had before my eyes a fifth gospel, torn but still legible; and henceforward, with the aid of Matthew's and Mark's narratives, I saw, instead of an abstract being who might be said to have never existed, an admirable human form, living and moving. During the summer, having had occasion to go up to Ghazir, on the Libanus, for the sake of a little rest, I fixed in rapid outline the image which had appeared to me; and this history is the result. When a cruel trial hastened my departure, I had only a few pages of it still to write. The book was, as it were, composed at once close by the very

---

* Vie de Jésus, par Ernest Renan, Membre de l'Institut. Deuxième edition. (Histoire des Origines du Christianisme, livre premier.)

† Histoire Generale des Langues Semitiques.
Le Livre de Job traduit, &c.
Cantique des Cantiques traduit, &c.
De l'Origine du Langage.
De la Part des Peuples Semitiques dans l'Histoire de la Civilization.
Chaire d'Hebreu au College de France, explication, &c.

places where Jesus was born and grew. Since my return, I have laboured diligently to verify or correct in detail the rough draft which I had hastily written in a Maronite cabin, with but five or six volumes at hand."—Introd. p. liii.

The vividness with which M. Renan admiringly sketches the scenery, of Galilee especially, bears out this account of his impressions, and constitutes the peculiar value and interest of his book.

An avowal follows which might reasonably, perhaps, have led the author to hesitate before presenting his book as his *matured* thoughts on Christianity. Its candour is charming; and the avowal itself is worth a chapter on Christian evidences.

"Some perhaps will regret the biographical turn which my book has thus taken. When first I contemplated a history of the origin of Christianity, what I meant to write was, in fact, a history of doctrines, in which men would scarcely have had any place. Jesus would scarcely have been named; my chief concern would have been to shew how the ideas produced under his name germinated till they covered the world. But I have since found out that history is not a mere game of abstractions, and that the men concerned in it are more than the doctrines. It was not a certain theory on Justification and Redemption that effected the Reformation;—it was Luther and Calvin. Parseeism, Hellenism, Judaism, might have combined together under all possible forms; the doctrines of the Resurrection and of the Word might have developed themselves for centuries, without producing that fact so fertile, so unique, so grand, which is called Christianity. That fact is the work of Jesus, of St. Paul and of St. John. To write the history of Jesus, of St. Paul and of St. John, is to write the history of the origin of Christianity. Previous movements only belong to our subject so far as they serve to explain these extraordinary men, who could not naturally have existed without connection with what preceded them."—Pref. pp. liv, lv.

It is a great step for a religious philosopher to have thus discovered, by means of a visit to the Holy Land, that the history of Christianity is the history of a life, and not of doctrines apart from men. Imagine the intended history of Christianity in which Jesus would scarcely have been named! But we must doubt whether our philosopher is even yet quite emancipated from the vulgar catholic and orthodox mistake of regarding it as a system of doctrines, and confounding with its doctrines those of heathen and middle-age philosophy and mythology. His opening statement of the historical problem which he has to solve is confused and incorrect. He says:

"The leading event in the history of the world is that revolution by which the noblest portions of the human race passed out of the ancient religions comprised under the vague name of Paganism, into a religion founded on the *Divine Unity, the Trinity and the incarnation of the Son of God.* This conversion needed nearly *a thousand years* to effect. The new religion itself had occupied *at least three centuries* in its formation. But the origin of the revolution of which we have to speak, was a

fact which took place under the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius. At that time lived a superior personage who, by his bold initiative and by the love which he inspired, created an object for the future faith of the human race and fixed its starting-point."—P. 1.

We do not grant, nor does our author himself believe (according to his volume), that Christianity was founded on all the doctrines above stated. Nor can we consent to put the history of the church for 300 or 1000 years on the same footing of miraculous or non-miraculous origin with the New-Testament history. How Christianity began is one question; how it was secularized and debased is another. He is not more correct in laying down the great problem of the Jewish religion (pp. 6, 7, 8). He speaks of it, indeed, as monotheistic, but without giving to that fact the emphasis which it possessed in the history of contemporary nations. The ark seems, by his account, to have been as essential a characteristic of Judaism as the monotheism. The law, he justly says, was altogether social and moral. He speaks of the prophets as possessing a high degree of *clairvoyance*, and does honour to their moral and religious characters, describing also the strong religious hope which they cherished of a *kingdom of God on earth* with a *world-renowned Jerusalem* as its centre. But he does not appear to see anything extraordinary either in this theology or in these spiritual hopes. *Nil admirari* seems to be our philosopher's maxim. Jewish and Christian philosophers have seen in these things effects so singular as to make it worth while to inquire into their special causes. But if his critical axioms be admitted, Jews and Christians have no right to form any opinion respecting the origin of their respective religions:

"To construct the history of a religion (he says) it is necessary, in the first place, to have been a believer in it (otherwise one could not realize how it has charmed and satisfied the human conscience); and in the second place, to have ceased to believe in it absolutely *(de n'y plus croire d'une manière absolue);* because absolute faith is incompatible with sincere history."—Pref. p. lix.

Can we then have no true history of the Newtonian philosophy unless from one who once believed in universal gravitation, but has ceased to believe it quite true? Must a reliable history of painting be written by one who once could paint, but has renounced the art as worthless? Must Alexander's or Napoleon's life be written by men who once believed in them enthusiastically, but now doubt their ability as generals? Strange qualification for writing a true history, whether of religion, art, science or conquest! He adds to the words last quoted, what we may cite as descriptive of his own prevailing idea of Jesus, in reference to whom he habitually uses terms of highest admiration mixed with what seem to us quite incompatible suggestions, and with mystical generalizations which quite destroy the seeming specialty of the eulogium.

"But love goes on without faith." [If we lost faith in Christ we think we must cease to love him.] "In ceasing to attach oneself to any of the forms which command the adoration of mankind, one does not refuse to taste what they contain that is good and beautiful." [But is it good and beautiful if, pretending to be divine, it is simply human?] "No transitory manifestation exhausts the Deity. God had revealed himself before Jesus; and will reveal himself again." [But some revelations are natural, others supernatural.] "Profoundly varied, and all the more divine" [a very ambiguous word] "in proportion as they are greater and more spontaneous, the manifestations of the Deity hidden in the depth of human consciousness are all of the same order." [That is the question.] "Jesus cannot therefore belong exclusively to those who call themselves his disciples." [There are other *therefores* that secure this result.] "He is the common honour of the human heart." [And not the less, if divinely inspired.] "His glory consists not in being relegated beyond history" [to relegate him into the miraculous does not throw him out of history]; "we pay him a truer honour by shewing that universal history is incomprehensible without him." [And in the supernatural view of Christianity, it is made comprehensible with him.]

The eloquent mysticism of such a passage as the above must not be allowed to exempt it from the critical effort to find a real meaning in it. That meaning is either most vague or is deceptive, in our view.

This volume is designed as the first of four volumes, or works, on the "History of the Origin of Christianity." This first contains the life of Jesus; and the second (beyond which the author seems to distrust the continuance of life and power) is to embrace the history of the apostles of Jesus and their immediate disciples; the third would trace the history of Christianity under the Antonines; and the fourth carry it down to Constantine.

The author treats this first part of this history just as he would any other history whatever. But when he comes to what is generally considered the specialty of the Christian history,—its superhuman wisdom and goodness, and its claims to a miraculous origin for these things,—he calmly puts the miraculous aside as a thing not worth argument, while seeming to admit (as far as under such conditions he can) the extraordinary elevation of the character of Jesus.

The reasonable advocate of Christianity cannot, of course, object to the attempt of the *savant* to account for the facts of Christianity on simply natural grounds. If such grounds be sufficient to explain it, we must, on the admitted principles of reasoning, take that explanation as the true one. But if they be not sufficient, their perceived insufficiency, of course, sends us in search of a further and deeper solution. To this issue the question of Christianity must and ought to come. We only fail to understand the position of those who deny the miraculous and yet seem to hold towards Christ and Christianity a kind of respect

and allegiance which is not by the same voices expressed towards Socrates, Mahomet and Sakya-Mouni (the sainted author of Buddhism), who by the argument are put on the same level exactly.

We shall endeavour (in this article and its continuation) to give a full and fair abstract of M. Renan's book. In France it has excited wide attention and very various feeling. That a book bearing the title "Life of Jesus," should have commanded attention at all in France, where society is supposed to be almost equally divided between unthinking Catholics and careless sceptics, is a matter worth notice. The *Lien* states that 15,000 copies were sold in a few days;—we have the second edition (no doubt involving a much larger number) before us. Of course the Catholic Church is horrified at the book. Possibly she may do it the honour of putting it in her *index expurgatorius*. Orthodox English folk will, in like manner, shake the empty head and hold up pious hands at it. The thoroughly sceptical party at home and abroad will just as much despise M. Renan's solution. He does not go far enough for them. His book is milk and water. He doubles with the hare and runs with the hounds. A writer in the *Revue des Deux-Mondes* (August 1) reproaches him for admitting too easily the authenticity of various sayings ascribed to Jesus (though ordinary critics think him quite sufficiently disposed to eliminate the history conjecturally). A pamphleteer (M. H. Disdier) of Geneva finds fault with the book for not going far enough.

The free Protestant Church of France meanwhile is disposed to look at the book more dispassionately, but not less critically; and the only free Protestant Church in England may surely do so too. We can admit and approve, as we have ever promoted, the earnest endeavour to trace out the human elements of Christ's history and character, which are too much thrown into the shade (and the reality of his history and the worth of his life thereby impugned) by the high orthodox scheme. And having done this to the fullest extent, we feel bound, equally by philosophical reasoning and Christian reverence, not to slur over those parts of his history which do not admit this naturalistic solution, but to claim for its supernatural aspects their equally appropriate cause.

We must therefore protest, *in limine*, against this high-handed ejection of miracle from the sphere of human history. Hume argued the question laboriously, however sophistically; Gibbon endeavoured to evade it by a side-tack in search of "secondary causes" which should practically stand instead of primary; many older countrymen of M. Renan have been satisfied to dismiss miracles with contemptuous wit and ridicule; but our author dismisses them with philosophical contempt,—a feeling unknown to true philosophy. We must protest against this way of clearing the ground for an inquiry into the origin of Christianity:

"None of the miracles of which ancient histories are full has occurred under *scientific conditions*. Never-failing observation shews us that miracles never happen except in countries where the belief in them is general, and before persons disposed to believe in them. No miracle has been produced before an assembly of men capable of deciding upon the miraculous character of a fact. Neither the populace nor people of the world are competent to that. Great precautions and a long habit of scientific research are necessary. Have we not, in our own days, seen almost all our people of the world becoming the dupes of gross tricks or puerile illusions? Wonderful facts attested by little towns in the mass (thanks to more severe inquiry) are become facts for the police.* If it is shewn that no contemporary miracle can bear discussion, is it not probable that the miracles of past times, which were performed in popular assemblages, would in like manner present to us their illusive side, if it were possible for us to criticise them in detail?

"It is not then in the name of any particular philosophy, but of constant experience, that *we banish miracle from history*. We do not say, 'Miracle is impossible;' we say, 'There has never yet been a miracle credibly proved' (constaté). Suppose a Thaumaturgist were to present himself to-morrow with guarantees sufficiently grave to warrant discussion; suppose he were to announce himself as able, shall we say, to raise the dead to life; what should we do? A commission would be named, composed of physiologists, physical philosophers, chemists, and adepts in historical criticism. This commission would make choice of a corpse, would satisfy themselves that the death was real, would appoint the room where the experiment should be made, would regulate the whole system of precautions necessary, so as to leave room for no doubt whatever. If, under such conditions, the resurrection succeeded, a probability almost equal to certainty would be gained. Still, as an experiment must always be capable of repetition, as any one can do again what he has done once, and as in the scale of miracle there can be no question of easy and difficult, the Thaumaturgist would be invited to repeat his marvellous deed in other circumstances, upon other corpses and in another company. If the miracle succeeded each time, two things would be proved: first, that supernatural facts do happen in the world; and second, that the power to produce them belongs, or is delegated, to certain persons. But who does not see that miracle has never happened under these conditions; that the Thaumaturgist has hitherto always chosen the subject of his experiment, chosen the company and the public beyond; and that, besides all this, the people themselves most commonly, through the unconquerable need they have of seeing something divine in great events and great men, create the miraculous legends afterwards? While then the present order of things lasts, we shall maintain this as a principle of historical criticism, that a supernatural narration cannot be admitted as such; that it always implies credulity or imposture; and that it is the duty of the historian to interpret it, and to investigate what portion of truth and what of error it may involve."—Int. pp. l—liii.

Thus summarily is the question of miracle precluded! What is this but to say in effect, that though it might suit the purposes

* "See Gazette des Tribunaux, Sept. 10, Nov. 11, 1854; May 28, 1857.

of Eternal Wisdom and Goodness to manifest itself by special means in the times of Moses or of Christ, and though Judea in those successive times was the true centre of observation and influence for the then civilized world, yet the required manifestation ought to have been held back till the times of the second empire of France, and should then have been manifested in such place in Paris as an imperial commission from Napoleon III. might fix! If it does not mean this, it means nothing. Christ's miracles were not such mere works of *Thaumaturgy*. (The word itself is invidious.) There was always a *heart* in them,—a feeling, a meaning and an opportuneness, as strong as in the common benevolent works of an ordinary man. To say (or imply, as this argument does) that instead of raising Lazarus whom he intimately knew, or curing the cripple or the deaf and dumb whom he casually met, he should have sent to the Sanhedrim (the only shadow of the modern scientific commission so grotesquely suggested), requesting them to find a corpse, a deaf-mute or a cripple, and name their own time and place for an *experiment* in Thaumaturgy, is a reversal of all the natural and historical principles which he applies at large to the *ordinary* events of Christ's mission. Of these he brings out, in many cases, the naturalness and force, with a true perception of the times which he has deeply studied, and the localities which he has reverently trod. To all such scenes he imparts a reality scarcely before given to them by traveller or commentator. It is only when he must supersede miracle that he is unnatural and unreal.

In another place he, without argument or reason assigned, makes the supernatural to be tantamount to *legendary*: "That the Gospels are in part legendary, is evident because they are full of the miraculous and supernatural; but there are legends of different orders." (Pref. p. xv.) Yet the legend is not confined by him to the supernatural. All ancient history abounds in this element; and, strictly speaking, we can scarcely regard any history as true! The duty of historic doubt seems, in the following passage, to be stretched to a very painful degree of metaphysical refinement; which, however, the author himself exchanges in practice for very clear conjectural certainties in place of the ever-doubted *text*:

"It is scarcely necessary to say that with such documents (as the Gospels), if we are to produce nothing but what is incontestable, we must limit ourselves to mere general outlines. In almost all ancient histories, even in such as are much less legendary than these, the details give occasion to an infinite number of doubts. When we have two narratives of the same fact, it is extremely rare that the two agree. Is not this a reason for imagining many complexities when we have only one account? We may say that, among the anecdotes, discourses and celebrated sayings related by historians, there is not one rigorously authentic. Were short-hand writers by, to fix those fleeting words?

Was there an annalist always present to note down the gestures, the expressions of face, the feelings of the agents? Let any one try to get at the truth as to the manner in which any contemporary fact has happened;—he will not succeed. Two narratives of an event by ocular witnesses differ essentially. Must we on that account give up the whole colouring of the story, and confine ourselves to the statement of the general fact? That would be to suppress all history. Doubtless, as I fully believe, if we except certain short and almost mnemonic axioms, not one of the discourses related by Matthew is textually exact; scarcely is it the case with our own legal investigations when stenographically reported. I willingly admit that his admirable narrative of the Passion includes a multitude of approximations *(renferme une foule d'à peu près)*. But would any one, composing the history of Jesus, omit those instructions which present to us in so life-like a manner the physiognomy (as it were) of his discourses, and confine himself to saying, with Josephus and Tacitus, 'that he was put to death by order of Pilate at the instigation of the priests'? This would, in my opinion, be a worse sort of inaccuracy than that to which we are liable in admitting the details supplied by the text of Scripture. These details are not true to the letter; but they are true in a higher truth; they are truer than the naked truth, in this sense: that they are the truth gifted with speech and expression, and raised to the height of ideality (à la hauteur d'une idée)."

This seems to us a very mystical, if not a misguiding, way of expressing the great principle of historical criticism, that the life and breath of history (just as of recent fact) consist in the details; and though those details may seem in some parts dubious, and in some may conflict with the details as given by another narrator, yet the fact is known more truly and more really (not more *ideally)* by means of those details reasonably accepted, than it could be if divested of them. History includes the thoughts, feelings and words, as well as the actions, of its personages. The principle itself is clear and important; and it is a pity that it should be so expressed as to seem suggestive of universal doubt, instead of being made the guide to moral certainty. Our author seems even to fear that he may himself be charged with ascribing too much weight to these deceptive but idealizing details. For he goes on:

"I beg those who may think I have placed undue reliance on narratives in a great degree legendary, to notice the observation I have just made. To what would the life of Alexander be reduced, if we confined ourselves to what is materially certain? Even traditions partly erroneous contain a portion of truth which history cannot neglect. M. Sprenger has not been reproached for having, in his Life of Mahomet, made great account of the *Nadith*, or oral traditions respecting the Prophet, and for having often ascribed verbally to his hero certain sayings that are only known from this source. The traditions respecting Mahomet, however, are not of superior historic order to the discourses and narratives which compose the Gospels. They were written between the years 50 and 140 of the Hegira. When the history of the Jewish

schools in the ages immediately preceding and following the birth of Christianity shall be written, no scruple will be felt in ascribing to Hillel, Schammäi and Gamaliel, the maxims attributed to them in the Mischna and the Gemara, though those great compilations were formed several centuries after the Rabbis in question."—P. xlix.

It must not be supposed, however, from this parallel, that M. Renan ascribes a low antiquity to the composition of the Gospels. On this very important question of sacred criticism, he holds far more orthodox views than some of our own speculative theologians have lately hazarded. He unhesitatingly ascribes the composition of all the four Gospels to the second half of the first century. He thinks those of Matthew and Mark to have been first written; and regards the former as most reliable for the discourses of Christ, the latter for the details of fact (which he ascribes ultimately to Peter). But he does not allow that the customary titles *(according to* Matthew, &c.) were meant to imply sole authorship, but rather to refer to Matthew's or Mark's original collection as the basis of the narrative in its completed form. These two Gospels, he says, are "impersonal;"—the authors are not perceivable in the *logia* (discourses) of the one or the narratives of the other. Luke's Gospel is a much more regular and complete composition, written (our author declares) "after the siege of Jerusalem, but very soon after." He founds this opinion upon some expressions ascribed to our Lord in the 21st chapter, predictive of the events of the siege; his philosophy forbidding the thought of miraculous prediction. We should argue, on the contrary, from certain *other* expressions betokening the common but erroneous expectation of the "end of the world" (whatever that may have been thought to mean), that this prophecy of our Lord must have been written in its present shape by some of his disciples *before* the destruction of Jerusalem, which, *after* that event had happened, they would surely have kept separate in their description from the still expected end of the world. John's Gospel (if it be John's, which he seems to doubt, though continually identifying John with it) he considers the least reliable of the four. His canvas is quite different from that of all the rest. If Jesus spoke as Matthew makes him, he could not speak as John represents. "Far from the simple, disinterested, impersonal tone of the synoptics, John's Gospel continually exhibits the preconceptions of the apologist, the latent thoughts of the sectary, the purpose of proving a thesis and confuting adversaries." He imports into the Gospel some of the Gnostic and kindred notions. "In ascribing these new ideas to Jesus," says our author (who has a mental theory ready to back each literary one), "he only followed a very natural tendency. *Our recollections become transformed with everything else belonging to us: our idea of a person whom we have known changes as we change. Considering Jesus as the incarnation of truth, John*

could not fail to attribute to him what he had himself come to regard as truth."

We doubt whether the above statement will correspond to the conscious facts of most minds accustomed to self-reflection. Recollections, we think, are not so soon self-belied; nor our own changes transferred by imagination upon other persons. To regard any one as "the incarnation of truth" would, we think, tend to keep our notions in accord with his known beliefs, rather than permit us to change first our own and then our recollection of his. But we must be content merely to cite this as one instance of the ready philosophy which accounts for the strangest things by alleged general tendencies of the mind, and which the carelessness or idleness of the reader may admit without thought, however contrary to fact.

We have thus far scarcely touched more than the introductory chapter of fifty-nine pages. We must defer to another article our intended abstract of the book, giving meanwhile one long and very interesting extract, conveying Professor Renan's view of the humanity of Jesus Christ, for the translation of which we are indebted to the ready and elegant pen of Sir John Bowring.

"It is beyond doubt that Jesus never pretended to be an incarnation of God himself. Such an idea was altogether alien to the Jewish spirit. There is no trace of it in the writings of the three first evangelists* (synoptiques), and it cannot even in the Gospel of John be discovered as representing the thoughts of Jesus, who seems sometimes to be anxious to repudiate such a doctrine.† The accusation of making himself God or the equal with God is presented in John's Gospel as a calumny of the Jews.‡ In this Gospel he declares himself to be less than his Father.§ Elsewhere he avows that all things have not been revealed to him.‖ He believes himself to be more than a common man, but separated by an infinite distance from God. He is the Son of God, but so all men are or may be in different degrees.¶ All, daily, should call God their Father,—all who rise from the dead will be sons of God.** Divine filiation was attributed in the Old Testament to beings who had no pretension to be equal with God.†† The word 'son' in the Semitic languages and in that of the New Testament has the broadest signification.‡‡ Besides, the idea which Jesus formed of man is not of that

---

"* Certain passages, such as Acts ii. 22, formally exclude the notion.

"† Matt. xix. 17; Mark x. 18; Luke xviii. 19.

"‡ John v. 18, &c., x. 33, &c. "§ John xiv. 28. "‖ Mark xiii. 35.

"¶ Matt. v. 9, 45; Luke iii. 38, vi. 35, xx. 36; John i. 12, 13, x. 34, 35; compare Acts xvii. 28, 29; Rom. viii. 14, 19, 21, ix. 26; 2 Cor. vi. 18; Gal. iii. 26; in the Old Testament, Deut. xiv. 1; and, above all, Wisdom ii. 13, 18.

"** Luke xx. 36.

"†† Gen. vi. 2; Job i. 6, ii. 1, xxxviii. 7; Ps. ii. 7, lxxxii. 6; 2 Sam. vii. 14.

"‡‡ The son of the devil, Matt. xiii. 38, Acts xiii. 10; son of this world, Mark iii. 17, Luke xvi. 8, xx. 34; sons of light, Luke xvi. 8, John xii. 36; sons of the resurrection, Luke xx. 36; sons of the kingdom, Matt. viii. 12, xiii. 38; children of the bridechamber, Matt. ix. 15, Mark ii. 19, Luke v. 34; sons of Gehenna, Matt. xxiii. 15; sons of peace, Luke x. 6. The Pagan Jupiter was *πατὴρ ανδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.*

humble character introduced by a cold deism. In his poetical conception of nature one breath pervades the universe; the breath of man is the breath of God,—God dwells in man,—lives through man, as man dwells in God and lives through God.* The transcendent idealism of Jesus did not allow him to have a very clear notion of his own personality. He is his Father, his Father is he. He lives in his disciples—he is with them everywhere†—his disciples are one, as he and his Father are one.‡ The idea is with him all in all—the body, which is but a personal distinction, is nothing.

"The title 'Son of God' or simply the 'Son'§ thus became for Jesus an analogous title to that of 'Son of Man,' and was also synonymous with 'Messiah,' the sole difference being that he called himself 'Son of Man,' but did not make the same use of 'Son of God.'‖ The title Son of Man expressed his character as judge, that of Son of God his participation in the supreme purposes and his power. This power has no limits. His Father has given him all power. He can even change the Sabbath.¶ No one knows the Father but by him.** To him alone has the Father committed the right of judgment.†† Nature obeys him, but obeys whosoever believes and prays. Faith can do all things.‡‡ Let it not be forgotten that in his mind and that of his auditors no idea of the laws of nature marked the limits of the impossible. The witnesses of his miracles thanked God that he had 'given such power unto men.'§§ He forgives sins‖‖—he is superior to David, to Abraham, to Solomon, to the prophets.¶¶ We do not know the shape or the measure of these affirmations. Jesus is not to be judged by the scale of our petty estimates. The admiration of his disciples surrounded him and carried him away. The title of rabbi, with which he was at first content, did not, it is evident, satisfy him; even the title of prophet, or sent of God, failed to respond to his thought. The position he assumed was that of a superhuman being, and he desired to be regarded as one having more elevated relations than other men with God. But let it be remarked that these words 'superhuman' and 'supernatural,' adopted by our narrow theology, had no meaning in the high religious conscience of Jesus. For him, nature and the development of humanity were not limited regions beyond God, miserable realities subject to the laws of a despairing empirism. For him there was nothing supernatural, because there was no nature. Fascinated by an infinite love, he forgot the heavy chain which keeps the spirit captive. At a leap he passed the abyss impassable for most,—the abyss which the mediocrity of the human faculties places between man and God.

"* Compare Acts xvii. 28.

"† Matt. xviii. 20, xxviii. 20.

"‡ John x. 30, xvii. 21. See generally the last discourses of John, especially chap. xvii., exhibiting clearly one side of the psychological character of Jesus, though they may not be considered as true historical documents.

"§ The passages which prove this are too numerous for citation.

"‖ It is only in the Gospel of John that Jesus in speaking of himself employs the expression 'Son of God,' or 'Son.'

"¶ Matt. xii. 8; Luke vi. 5.

"** Matt. xi. 27.

"†† John v. 22.

"‡‡ Matt. xvii. 18, 19; Luke xvii. 6.

"§§ Matt. ix. 8.

"‖‖ Matt. ix. 2, &c.; Mark xi. 5, &c.; Luke v. 20, vii. 47, 48.

"¶¶ Matt. xii. 41, 42, xx. 43, &c.; John viii. 52, &c.

"It is not denied that in these affirmations of Jesus there was the germ of the doctrine which should afterwards convert him into a divine hypostasis* by identifying him with the Word, or 'second God,'† or 'eldest Son of God,'‡ or métathrone§ angel, which, on the other hand, was created by Jewish theology.‖ A sort of necessity introduced this theology to correct the extreme rigour of the ancient monotheism by placing near God an assessor to whom the eternal Father is supposed to delegate the government of the universe. The belief that certain men are the incarnations of divine faculties or 'powers' was widely spread; the Samaritans had at the same time a Thaumaturgist, named Simon, who was identified with 'the great virtue of God.'¶ For more than two centuries the speculative minds of Judaism allowed themselves to lean towards the creation of distinct persons invested with divine attributes or by certain expressions associated with the divinity. Thus the 'breath of God' often mentioned in the Old Testament is considered as a separate being—'the Holy Spirit.' So the 'wisdom of God,' the 'word of God,' become self-existent persons. This was the germ of the process which engendered the Sephiroths of the Cabbala, the Æons of Gnosticism, the Christian hypostases,—all the dry mythology which consists in personified abstractions to which monotheism is obliged to have recourse when it seeks to introduce a multiplicity in God.

"Jesus seems to have remained a stranger to these refinements of theology which were soon to fill the world with sterile disputes. The metaphysical theory of *the Word,* as it is found in the writings of his contemporary Philo, in the Chaldee Targums, and already in the book of Wisdom,** cannot be discovered in the *logia* of Matthew nor in the synoptics (the three first evangelists), the authentic interpreters of the words of Jesus. The doctrine of the Word, in fact, had nothing in common with the Messiahship. The 'Word' of Philo and the Targums is in no respect the Messiah. It was John the evangelist or his school who afterwards endeavoured to prove that Jesus is the Word, and who in

"* See especially John xiv. and following, but it is doubtful whether these are authentic teachings of Jesus.

"† Philo, cited by Eusebius, Præp. Evang. vii. 13.

"‡ Philo, De Mig. Abraham, § 1; Quod Deus immut. § 6; De Conf. Ling, § 14 and 28; De profugis, § 20; De Somniis, § 37; De Agric. Noë, § 12; Quis rerum divin. Hæres, § 25 and following, 48 and following.

"§ Μετάθρονος, or sharing the throne of God, a sort of divine secretary keeping the record of merits and demerits: Bereschith Rabba, v. 6 c; Talm. de Bab. Sanhedr., 38 b; Chagiga, 15 a; Targum de Jonathan, Gen. v. 24.

"‖ This theory of the λόγος has in it no Greek element. The assimilations of it with the *Honover* of the Parsees are also without foundation. The *Minokhired,* or 'Divine Intelligence,' has an analogy with the Jewish λόγος (see the Fragments of the book called Minokhired in Spiegel, Parsi-Grammatik, 161-2). But the development of the Minokhired doctrine among the Parsees is modern, and indicates a foreign influence. 'Divine intelligence,' *Mainyu-Khratû,* is found in the Zend books; but it is not the basis of a theory, it is only discoverable in some invocations. Perhaps there is some value in the affinities which have been sought between the Alexandrine theory of the Word and certain points of Egyptian theology. Nothing, however, shews that in the centuries which preceded the Christian era the Judaism of Palestine borrowed anything from Egypt.

"¶ Acts viii. 10.

"** ix. 1, 2, xvi. 12; compare vii. 12, viii. and following; ix. and generally ix.—xi. These personal pictures of individualized wisdom are found in far more ancient books: Prov. viii. ix.; Job xxviii.

this respect created a theology entirely new, very different from that of the kingdom of God.* The essential function of the Word is that of Creator and of Providence, but Jesus never pretended to have created or to govern the world. His office is to judge it, to renew it. To be president over the final assizes of humanity is the essential attribute which Jesus takes to himself, the function to which he is appointed by all the first Christians.† Till the great day he sits on the right hand of God, as his *métathrone*, his prime minister and future punishment awarder (vengeur).‡ The superhuman Christ of the Byzantine *absides*, seated as judge of the world, in the midst of the apostles analogous to him and superior to the angels who are present to serve, is the very exact figured representation of this conception of the 'Son of Man,' of whom the first sketches are so strongly marked in the book of Daniel.

"In any case, the rigour of a reflected scholasticism had nothing in it of such a world. The whole amount of the ideas we have been expounding formed in the spirit of the disciples a theological system so vaguely defined that the Son of God, this sort of redoubling of the divinity, is made by them to act simply as a man. He is tempted; he is ignorant of many things; he corrects himself;§ he is dejected, discouraged; prays his Father to spare him from suffering; and is subject to God as a Son.‖ He who is to judge the world knows not the day of judgment.¶ He takes precautions for his safety.** Soon after his birth it is necessary to conceal him from those powerful men who would have killed him.†† In the exorcisms he is chicaned by the devil, who does not give way at first.‡‡ In his miracles a painful effort is felt, a fatigue as if something had left him.§§ All this exhibits the fact of an envoy of God—of a man perfected and favoured by God.‖‖ No logic, no consequence, is required here. The need that Jesus had of obtaining the credence and the enthusiasm of his disciples reconciled contradictory notions. For the messianists of the millennium school, for the devoted readers of the books of David and Enoch, he was the Son of Man,—for the Jews of the common creed, for the readers of Isaiah and Micah, he was the Son of David,—for the affiliated, he was the Son of God, or simply the Son. Others, unblamed by the disciples, considered him as John the Baptist resuscitated, or Elias, or Jeremiah, according to the popular belief that the ancient prophets would arise to prepare the times of the Messiah.¶¶

"An absolute conviction, or rather an enthusiasm which removed

---

"* John i. 1—14; 1 John v. 7; Rev. xix. 13. It should, however, be remarked that 'the Word' is never found except in the prologue, and that the narrator never places it in the mouth of Jesus.

"† Acts x. 42.

"‡ Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xvi. 19; Luke xxii. 69; Acts vii. 55; Rom. viii. 34; Eph. i. 20; Col. iii. 1; Heb. i. 3, 13, viii. 1, x. 12, xii. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 22; see note on the *Métathrone*.

"§ Matt. x. 5, compare with xxviii. 19. "‖ Matt. xxvi. 39; John xii. 27.

"¶ Mark xiii. 32.

"** Matt. xii. 14—16, xiv. 13; Mark iii. 6, 7, ix. 30, 31; John vii. 1 and following.

"†† Matt. ii. 20. "‡‡ Matt xvii. 20; Mark ix. 25.

"§§ Luke viii. 45, 46; John xi. 33, 38. "‖‖ Acts ii. 22.

"¶¶ Matt. xiv. 2, xvi. 14, xvii. 3, and following; Mark vi. 14, 15, viii. 28; Luke ix. 8—19.

even the possibility of a doubt, covered all these darings. With our cold and timid natures we little understand such possession taken by an idea of which we make ourselves the apostle. Among us, deeply serious races as we are, conviction is synonymous with self-sincerity. But this sincerity towards oneself is not very intelligible to Oriental peoples, who are little habituated to the sensibilities of a critical spirit. Good faith and imposture are words which in our rigid conscience are opposed as two irreconcilable terms. But in the East there are a thousand vibrations and turns between them. The authors of the Apocryphal books (Daniel and Enoch, for example), men so excited, committed for their cause, without the shadow of a scruple, an act which we should call false. Material truth has little value for the Oriental; he sees everything through the medium of his ideas, his interests, his passions.

"History would be an impossibility if we did not boldly admit that sincerity must have many measures. All great things are done by the people, and the people cannot be led but by adopting its ideas. The philosopher who, knowing this, isolates and entrenches himself in his own nobility is highly praiseworthy. But he who takes humanity with its illusions, and seeks to act upon it and with it, cannot be blamed. Cæsar knew well that he was not the son of Venus. France would not be what she is if a thousand years ago there had been no belief in the holy phial of Rheims. It is easy for us, impotent as we are, to call this a lie; and, proud of our timid honesty, to treat with disdain the heroes who under other circumstances have entered upon the contest of life. When we have done with our scruples what they did with their lies, we shall have the right to treat them with severity. But at least let us markedly distinguish societies such as ours, where all passes in the full light of reflection, from societies simple and credulous where the creeds were born which have ruled for ages. There is no great foundation which does not repose on a legend, and the only guilty one in such case is that humanity which desires to be deceived."—Pp. 242—254.

We leave the above extract without comment for the present, as a fair sample of the mixed qualities of M. Renan's book, which we shall carefully analyze in our next number.

LOVE BETTER THAN GENIUS.

One of our countrymen has achieved for himself extraordinary scientific renown; he pierced the mysteries of nature, he analyzed her processes, he gave new elements to the world. The same man applied his rare intellect to the construction of a simple and very common instrument—that well-known lamp which has been the guardian of the miner's life from the explosion of fire. His discoveries are his nobility in this world, his trifling invention gives him rank in the world to come. By the former he shines as one of the brightest luminaries in the firmament of science; by the latter, evincing a spirit animated and directed by Christian love, he takes his place as one of the church of God. And such is the true order of rank which graces occupy in reference to gifts. F. W. Robertson.

HYMNS TO THE HOLY SPIRIT, AND ON THE RESURRECTION.

Sir,

If you think the accompanying attempts to render a couple of Latin hymns into something like the style and metre of the original, not unworthy of a small space in your pages, they may help to furnish those who have no other access to them, with some idea of the not unwholesome spiritual food which nourished the devotion of a less enlightened age. As some compensation to your readers, I place beside them line by line the exquisite originals.

Hymnophilus.

I.

To the Holy Spirit.	Ad Spiritum Sanctum.*
Come, Holy Spirit, come,	Veni, Sancte Spiritus,
Send from thy heavenly home	Et emitte cœlitus
Of thine own light a ray.	Lucis tuæ radium.
Come, Father of the poor,	Veni, Pater pauperum,
Come, thou of gifts Bestower,	Veni, dator munerum,
Shine in our souls as day:	Veni, lumen cordium:
Thou best Consoler, come,	Consolator optime,
Make in our hearts thy home,	Dulcis hospes animæ,
Sweet breath of cooling peace:	Dulce refrigerium:
Lighten the toil of life,	In labore requies,
Temper its feverish strife,	In æstu temperies,
And let our weeping cease.	In fletu solatium.
O Light of lights most pure,	O lux beatissima,
The inmost heart assure	Reple cordis intima
Of them that trust in thee.	Tuorum fidelium.
Without thy power serene	Sine tuo numine
Nothing in man is clean,	Nihil est in homine,
Nothing from guilt is free.	Nihil est innoxium.
Wash thou the life defiled;	Lava quod est sordidum;
Rain on the sandy wild;	Riga quod est aridum;
The bleeding heart restore:	Sana quod est saucium:
Our frozen souls subdue;	Flecte quod est rigidum;
O let them melt like dew,	Fove quod est frigidum;
And be perverse no more.	Rege quod est devium.
On trusting souls and free	Da tuis fidelibus
Who seek their strength in thee,	In te confidentibus
Pour out thy sevenfold grace;	Sacrum septenarium;
The crown to virtue give;	Da virtutis meritum;
And let the rescued live	Da salutis exitum;
In endless joy and praise.	Da perenne gaudium.

* Ascribed to Robert II., king of France, who succeeded his father, Hugh Capet, A.D. 997—the darkest and most distracted period of the middle ages.

II.

On our Lord's Resurrection.	In Resurrectione Domini.*
Weep no more, O Magdalen,	Pone luctum, Magdalena,
Dry those flowing tears;	Et serena lacrymas;
Not at Simon's heartless supper	Non est jam Simonis cœna,
Feel'st thou now a sinner's fears.	Non cur fletum exprimas;
Boundless source of joy possessing,	Causæ mille sunt lætandi,
Grateful praise thou com'st confessing.	Causæ mille exultandi:
Let thy halleluiah sound!	Alleluia resonet.
Smile once more, O Magdalen,	Sume risum, Magdalena,
Clear thy shaded brow;	Frons nitescat lucida;
Sin and shame have all departed,	Demigravit omnis pœna,
Light celestial cheers thee now.	Lux coruscat fulgida;
Christ the freeing word hath spoken,	Christus mundum liberavit,
And the arm of death hath broken.	Et de morte triumphavit:
Let thy halleluiah sound!	Alleluia resonet.
Rejoice, exult, O Magdalen,	Gaude, plaude, Magdalena,
Christ hath burst the tomb;	Tumbâ Christus exiit;
Nature's agony is over,	Tristis est peracta scena,
And the dread of mortal doom.	Victor mortis rediit;
Whom thou wep'st, in silence mourning,	Quem deflebas morientem,
Welcome back with smiles returning.	Nunc arride resurgentem:
Let thy halleluiah sound!	Alleluia resonet.
Lift thine eyes, O Magdalen,	Tolle vultum, Magdalena,
See thy Lord once more;	Redivivum obstupe;
See his face with sweetness beaming,	Vide frons quàm sit amæna,
And the grievous wounds he bore;	Quinque plagas aspice;
Now like pearls his form adorning,	Fulgent sicut margaritæ,
Lights that shine in heav'n's new morning.	Ornamenta novæ vitæ:
Let thy halleluiah sound!	Alleluia resonet.
Live, now live, O Magdalen,	Vive, vive, Magdalena,
Thy light is come again;	Tua lux reversa est;
Let thy soul in rapture swelling	Gaudiis turgescat vena,
Feel that life's last foe is slain.	Mortis vis abstersa est:
Gone are now thy days of sorrow,	Mæsti procul sunt dolores,
Love shall crown the endless morrow.	Læti redeant amores:
Let thy halleluiah sound!	Alleluia resonet.

* This is given, without date or name of author, by Dean Trench (in his Sacred Latin Poetry) from Walraff's *Corolla Hymnorum* and Daniel's *Thesaurus Hymnologus*. From internal indications I conjecture this beautiful ode to be of more recent origin.

NONCONFORMITY IN ESSEX.*

The handsome and in many respects careful volume of which the title is given below, owes its existence to the Committee of the Essex Congregational Union. It is a Bicentenary contribution to the history of English Nonconformity, and the collection is creditable to the industry and sagacity of its editor. It has many serious defects, some of them the inevitable consequences of the mode in which the work has been produced. History and biography cannot be written to order. An author to succeed in these departments must have a special taste for them, and must have devoted years of patient toil to their investigation. It is not enough that use has been made of the obvious sources of information. These are soon exhausted; but an earnest inquirer will in the course of time gather much additional information, and of the most valuable kind, in general reading and through access to MS. diaries and other documents stored up in public libraries or in the possession of individuals. To rush into print with the first results of historical investigation is necessarily to give the public an imperfect book. The mischief of such books is a serious drawback to their usefulness. Their existence often prevents the composition of better books on the same subject.

It is only fair to the intelligent and candid author of this volume to state that he admits that he had made little or no special preparation for his work, and that the collection and arrangement of his materials has been effected under many disadvantages. So many sources of historical and biographical information are now being for the first time thrown open to students in the collected treasures of our government and public offices, and the spirit of those who are their accredited guardians is so much more liberal than in former days, that undue haste in publication is now more than ever to be deprecated. To local committees, eager to give to the public proofs of zeal and efficiency, the Horatian maxim, *Nonum prematur in annum*, will naturally seem impracticable. For this and other reasons, we would rather receive historical treatises from independent inquirers led to their work by individual taste and special aptitude, and free from all the impatient impulses of a public body.

In respect to the history of English Nonconformity, we entirely approve of its being undertaken in local divisions. The writer should be on the spot, or at least should have a personal fami-

* Annals of Evangelical Nonconformity in the County of Essex from the Time of Wycliffe to the Restoration; with Memorials of the Essex Ministers who were ejected or silenced in 1660—1662, and Brief Notices of the Essex Churches which originated with their Labours. By T. W. Davids, Pastor of the Congregational Church, Lion Walk, Colchester. 8vo. Pp. 641. London—Jackson, Walford and Hodder. 1863.

liarity with the district the history of which he writes. But in the execution of local histories, the writer should be careful to avoid the unnecessary repetition of matters which belong to general history. Unless this rule be attended to, the size of our books of local history will be needlessly enlarged, and the time and patience of the reader wasted. Here and there in the volume before us we find topics which do not exclusively belong to the locality of which it treats.

The county of Essex has from an early period favoured the cause of Nonconformity. In Wycliffe's lifetime he had many followers here. John Ball, the associate in rebellion of Tyler, a priest of Colchester, is claimed by Mr. Davids as possibly "the first known Wycliffist martyr." It is a new thing to have him spoken of with respect. Collier describes him as "the mainspring" of the rebellion, who "opened the prospect of liberty to the mob and preached them into rebellion." Thomas Fuller certainly goes beyond the truth when he says of Ball that not the least compliance with Wycliffe or his doctrine was charged on him or confessed by him. Mr. Davids quotes a Latin tract, lately republished, in which it is distinctly stated that Ball confessed to being a disciple of the reformer; and Knighton alleges that Ball was in the interest of the Wycliffites.

Colchester was an early seat of Lollardism, and the martyrs' fire was used in vain in the effort to extirpate it. When Tyndale had translated the New Testament in 1525, copies poured into England through the eastern ports, and Essex received many of them.

"In 1530, William Worsley, priest and hermit, was abjured for preaching at Halstead, having the curate's license but not the bishop's, and for saying 'that no man riding on pilgrimages having under him a soft saddle and an easy horse should have any merit thereby, but the horse and saddle, and that hearing of matins and mass is not the thing that shall save a man's soul, but only to hear the word of God.' In 1531, Grace Palmer, of St. Osythe's, was abjured for saying among other things, 'that the sacrament is but bread which the priest there showeth for a token or remembrance of Christ's body.' In the same year, John Fairstede, of Colchester, was also in trouble 'for words spoken against images, and for saying that the day should come that men should say, Cursed be they that make these false gods, meaning images.' And in the month of November, 1531, Richard Bayfield, who while he was a monk at Bury St. Edmunds, had been converted under the teaching of Dr. Barnes, was burnt at Smithfield. Shortly after his conversion, Bayfield fled beyond sea, where he mightily prospered in the word of God, and was beneficial to Master Tyndale and Master Frith; for he brought substance with him, and was their own hand, and sold all their works and the works of the Germans, both in France and in England, and among other parts of England here in Essex. One of the agents whom Bayfield employed in the circulation of these books was 'a boy of Colchester.' This boy was taken shortly after the apprehension of

his employer, for having brought to Richard Bayfield a budget of books about four days before the said Bayfield was taken, for which he was laid in the compter by Master More, Chancellor, and there died."—Pp. 8, 9.

The iconoclastic spirit of the early reformers led them to demolish in many of the parish churches the shrines on which crucifixes or the relics of saints were placed. These were called *rood-lofts*, and several Essex men, more zealous than wary, paid with the penalty of their life for their share in these tumultuous acts of sacrilege. There is scarcely a considerable town in the county which is not in some way identified in the 16th century with the cause of the Reformation; but Colchester, Dedham, Braintree, Halsted and Bocking, are prominent. What the spirit of the Essex "Gospellers" was we may gather from the deliberations of about sixty of them who met, January 27, 1550, to consider whether it were necessary to stand or kneel, bare-headed or covered, at prayers. They came to the conclusion that the ceremony was altogether immaterial, that the heart before God was required, and nothing else. Although this took place in the reforming days of Edward VI., these men were looked upon as dangerous to Church and State, and the sheriff of the county was ordered to arrest them.

In the dreadful times of the Marian persecution there were but few districts in this county where the people did not see the kindling of fire for some martyr fonder of religious truth than of life. Brave men and women went to a dreadful death of this kind at Brentwood, Raleigh, Horndon, Billericay, Braintree, Maldon, Rochford, Coggleshall, Chelmsford, Colchester, Manningtree, Harwich, Maldon, Saffron Walden, Stratford and Waltham Abbey. Essex was one of the five parts on which the rage and vehemency of this terrible persecution did chiefly light. The first Essex martyr in Mary's reign was William Hunter, who died at Brentwood on March 26, 1555. In the three years that followed, forty-eight other victims perished in this county. In 1556, Stratford-le-Bow witnessed a holocaust in which thirteen martyrs of both sexes perished; and at Colchester, in the following year, the fires were lighted at the same time for ten victims. The story of Hunter's death, the protomartyr from Essex, is beautifully told by Mr. Froude, and we give it in his words rather than those of Mr. Davids (both are founded on the story left in writing by the martyr's brother, preserved by Foxe).

"The London apprentices had been affected deeply by the Reforming preachers. It was to them that the servant of Anne Askew 'made her moan,' and gathered subscriptions for her mistress. William Hunter, who was one of them, had been ordered to attend mass by a priest when it was re-established; he had refused, and his master, fearing that he might be brought into trouble, had sent him home to his family at

Brentwood, in Essex. Another priest, going one day into Brentwood Church, found Hunter reading the Bible there.

"Could he expound Scripture, that he read it thus to himself? the priest asked. He was reading for his comfort, Hunter replied; he did not take on himself to expound. The Bible taught him how to live, and how to distinguish between right and wrong.

"It was never merry world, the priest said, since the Bible came forth in English. He saw what Hunter was—he was one of those who disliked the queen's laws, and he and other heretics would broil for it before all was over.

"The boy's friends thought it prudent that he should fly to some place where he was not known; but, as soon as he was gone, a Catholic magistrate in the neighbourhood required his father to produce him, on peril of being arrested in his place; and, after a struggle of affection, in which the father offered to shield his son at his own hazard, young Hunter returned and surrendered.

"The magistrate sent him to the Bishop of London, who kept him in prison three quarters of a year. When the persecution commenced, he was called up for examination.

"Bonner, though a bigot and a ruffian, had, at times, a coarse good-nature in him, and often, in moments of pity, thrust an easy recantation upon a hesitating prisoner. He tried with emphatic anxiety to save this young apprentice. 'If thou wilt recant,' he said to him, 'I will make thee a freeman in the city, and give thee forty pounds in money to set up thy occupation withal; or I will make thee steward of mine house, and set thee in office, for I like thee well.'

"Hunter thanked him for his kindness; but it could not be, he said; he must stand to the truth: he could not lie, or pretend to believe what he did not believe. Bonner said, and probably with sincere conviction, that if he persisted he would be damned for ever. Hunter said, that God judged more righteously, and justified those whom man unjustly condemned.

"He was therefore to die with the rest; and on Saturday, the 23rd of March, he was sent to suffer at his native village. Monday being the feast of the Annunciation, the execution was postponed till Tuesday. The intervening time he was allowed to spend with his friends 'in the parlour of the Swan Inn.' His father prayed that he might continue to the end in the way that he had begun. His mother said, she was happy to bear a child who could find in his heart to lose his life for Christ's sake. 'Mother,' he answered, 'for my little pain which I shall suffer, which is but a short braid, Christ hath promised me a crown of joy. May you not be glad of that, mother?'

"Amidst such words the days past. Tuesday morning the sheriff's son came and embraced him, 'bade him not be afraid,' and 'could speak no more for weeping.' When the sheriff came himself for him, he took his brother's arm and walked calmly to the place of execution, 'at the town's end, where the butts stood.'

"His father was at the roadside as he passed. 'God be with thee, son William!' the old man said. 'God be with thee, good father,' the son answered, 'and be of good comfort.'

"When he was come to the stake, he took one of the faggots, knelt upon it, and prayed for a few moments. The sheriff read the pardon

with the conditions. 'I shall not recant,' he said, and walked to the post, to which he was chained.

"'Pray for me, good people, while you see me alive,' he said to the crowd.

"'Pray for thee!' said the magistrate who had committed him, 'I will no more pray for thee than I will pray for a dog.'

"'Son of God,' Hunter exclaimed, 'shine on me!' The sun broke out from behind a cloud and blazed in glory on his face.

"The faggots were set on fire.

"'Look,' shrieked a priest, 'how thou burnest here, so shalt thou burn in hell!'

"The martyr had a Prayer-book (a psalter?) in his hands, which he cast through the flames to his brother.

"'William,' said the brother, 'think on the holy passion of Christ, and be not afraid of death.'

"'I am not afraid,' were his last words. 'Lord, Lord, Lord, receive my spirit.'" (Froude's History of England, VI. 334—337.)

The martyrs broke the spell of Popery and made its re-establishment in England impossible. The selection of victims from the lower classes of society has been eloquently noted by Mr. Froude. The Marian persecutors "took the weaver from his loom, the carpenter from his workshop, the husbandman from his plough. They laid hands on maidens and boys, who had never heard of any other religion than that which they were called on to abjure, * * * and of these they made their burnt offerings." Such spectacles made an ineffaceable impression on the popular mind of England. Detestation of Popery came home to every homestead of the common people. In Essex it helped to give free course first to Puritanism and then to Nonconformity.

The Act of Uniformity, passed soon after Elizabeth's accession, in the first instance drove only three Essex clergymen from their livings. But when tidings reached the Queen of various acts of Nonconformity that prevailed in the county, she gave orders to Bishop Parker to suppress all Nonconformity throughout his province. The gentry of Essex met at Chelmsford on Christmas-day, 1569, and, to the number of seventy, agreed to a loyal and orthodox address, promising on their parts unreserved ecclesiastical submission. But this document by no means represented the feelings of the mass of the people, and especially of the yeomanry and some of the lesser gentry, amongst whom the leaven of Puritan sentiment had powerfully worked. During the whole of Elizabeth's reign, the struggle went on between the Puritanism of the people and the force of ecclesiastical law. In 1584, Lord Burleigh protested to Whitgift himself against the twenty-four articles of examination which the ministers had to answer, as more crafty and searching than the arts which the Inquisition of Spain use to trap their prey: the whole proceeding, he said, savoured too much of the Romish Inquisition, and was a device to seek rather than reform offenders. Nearly fifty

ministers were deprived or silenced in Essex alone. Their places were filled by men ignorant, idle or of scandalous lives. The laity in Rochford, Maldon and other places, petitioned Parliament and used other influences to obtain relief for the persecuted ministers, but in vain. The closing portions of Elizabeth's reign were marked by still more stringent measures against the nonconforming Puritans. Banishment and even death were the punishments awarded to resolute Nonconformity. Mr. Davids gives as an Appendix to that part of his work which relates to the Elizabethan persecution, a survey of sixteen (out of nineteen) hundreds in Essex. The number of benefices therein was 335. In 173, rather more than half, the ministers are described as "ignorant and unpreaching," 61 were pluralists, 10 of those holding single benefices were non-resident, and 12 were men of scandalous lives. Only about one-third, therefore, of the beneficed clergy were able or disposed to fill the duty of their cures. The same Appendix also contains a list of the preachers in Essex who had been subjected to persecution, some for non-subscription, others for refusing to wear the surplice or to conform to the ceremonies enjoined by the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer. In the reign of James, if the persecution was in any degree relaxed, it was rather the consequence of the feebleness of the monarch than of any purpose to grant religious liberty. Mr. Davids notices in passing the death of Bartholomew Leggat, one of the last of the English martyrs, whose heresy consisted in a denial of the Deity of Christ and of the doctrine of the Trinity. He was a native of Essex, and had a brother named Thomas, who was also charged with heresy, and died in Newgate. Mr. Davids apparently gives 1611 as the date of Bartholomew Leggat's death; it was really 1612. The spirit of the Prelatical party of Essex appeared about 1619 in a publication of Thomas Drax, vicar of Dovercourt, who insolently tells his Nonconforming neighbours that if they cannot submit, they had better remove to Virginia and make a plantation there in the hope to convert the infidels.

"What Drax intended only as an idle taunt, hundreds were already meditating in sober seriousness. Three years afterwards the way was opened by the Speedwell and the Mayflower. The Mayflower reached Cape Cod in the month of November, 1620."—P. 134.

Laud became connected with the county of Essex in 1609, and held the rectory of West Tilbury for seven years. But his preferments and changes were so numerous and rapid, and he at so early a period took an active share in the general affairs of the Church, that he made no deep local impressions of his character and tastes. Certain it is that some of his benefices fared but ill under his spiritual rule. But when he came to make his will, he did not quite forget the poor of his Essex rectory. When, under Laud's command, the powers of Church and State were

directed to the suppression of the Lectures which had been made the means of promoting the views of the Puritan party, some of the more earnest of the Essex clergy, e.g., John Rogers, of Dedham, Daniel Rogers, of Wethersfield, and John Archer, of Halsted, fell into trouble. Some, terrified by the power of the hierarchy, fled to Holland, others crossed the Atlantic. Amongst those that took the longer voyage was Thomas Hooker, who played a distinguished part both in England and America. He settled at Colchester about 1626, both as curate and lecturer; but his influence soon extended far beyond the limits of that town. This is the remarkable description which one of Laud's correspondents gives of this man:

"If these jealousies . . . . be increased by a rigorous proceeding against him, ye country may prove very dangerous. If he be suspended, ... it's the resolution of his friends and himself to settle his abode in Essex, and maintenance is promised him in plentifull manner for the fruition of his private conference, which hath already more impeached the peace of our church than his publique ministry. His genius will still haunte all the pulpits in ye country, where any of his scholers may be admitted to preach. . . . . All regular and discrete men, especially that live in popular places, will be brought into that distast and contempt among their people by theere meanes as their burthen will become intolerable. There are divers among young ministers about us, ... that . . . . spend their time . . . . in conference with him . . . . and return home . . . . and preach . . . . what he hath brewed. . . . Our people's pallats grow so out of tast, yt noe food contents them but of Mr. Hooker's dressing. I have lived in Essex to see many changes, and have seene the people idolizing many new ministers and lecturers, but this man surpasses them all for learning and some other considerable partes, and . . . . gains more and far greater followers than all before him."—Pp. 150, 151.

When proceedings were taken against Hooker, a petition from forty-nine of the Essex clergy in his behalf was forwarded to Laud. But then, as now, public documents of this kind were got up under pressure, and some of the signatures were entitled to little consideration. Some of the names appeared shortly after to a memorial of an opposite character, of which the burthen was the need of uniformity. Though Hooker had some powerful friends in England, he fled; and after a brief stay in Holland he sailed to America. There he and a party of Essex followers established the town of Cambridge.

An Essex associate of Thomas Hooker was the afterwards celebrated John Eliot, the apostle to the Indians. He, too, was one of the objects of Laud's persecution; so also was Thomas Shepard, who was afterwards a very useful minister in New England.

Another of the Essex clergy whom Laud hunted from place to place was John Beedle, rector of Barnstone, of whom Laud reported that he had been guilty of "getting himself many ignorant followers, and preaching disorderly three hours together."

Another celebrated name connected with the Nonconformity of Essex was Dr. Bastwick, a physician practising at Colchester. His book, entitled, "Elenchus Religionis Papisticæ," &c., was regarded by Laud as an attack on the English prelates, and brought down upon him the iron hand of the Primate in its heaviest weight. The issue was joyfully told to Strafford by the Archbishop in these words: "On Wednesday, June 14 (1637), three of our great libellers,—Bastwick, Burton and Prinn,—were taken *pro confessis* (for answer they would not in form of law), and censured to perpetual imprisonment,—Bastwick at the castle of Launceston,* in Cornwall; Burton at the castle in Lancaster; and Prinn at the castle in Carnarvon; fined five thousand pounds apiece; to stand in the pillory, and lose their ears," &c.

The merciful Archbishop remembered that the ears of Prinn had on a previous occasion been mutilated as part of his punishment for the publication of Histriomastix, and he proceeds to assure his correspondent that the ears of "Prinn appeared at the bar scarce touched, or but at the hem." When the tide turned, Bastwick was released by the Parliament and loaded with honours and rewards. But it does not appear that the £5000 compensation assigned him, to be paid out of the estates of Laud and from other sources, ever reached his hands. He returned after his release to Colchester, and there passed the residue of his life.

Three of the authors of Smectymnuus—viz. Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy and Matthew Newcomen—were connected with Essex. Mr. Davids always erroneously prints the word, composed of the writers' initial letters, *Smectymnus*. The initials of the last of the Smectymnuans were W.S., *uus.*, William Spurstowe, the ejected minister of Hackney. Indeed, we must notice with grave complaint the gross inaccuracies which swarm in the Latin extracts given in this volume, so frequent that, with every disposition to give the author the benefit of his printer's errors, we cannot but suspect another cause.

The long pent-up sorrows and wrath of the Puritans of Essex burst forth in 1642, when they prepared a petition to both Houses rehearsing the wrongs done to religion, civil liberty and to agriculture and trade, and asked amongst other things for the reformation of religion, the removal of the Bishops from the House of Lords, and the restoration to the commission of the peace in Essex of gentlemen removed for non-compliance with the turn of the times. Twenty thousand hands were put to this petition, and the petition was conveyed to London by a multitude of

* Bastwick on his release published a new edition of his Flagellum, the Preface of which contains in Latin a statement of his case, addressed to the King, Parliament and People of England. The minute account of his sufferings and the indignities he underwent in his Cornish prison, under the inhuman care of Thomas Bassett, a man whose baseness was a disgrace to an honourable descent, deserves more attention than it seems hitherto to have received.

Essex men (said to be 6000 in number), and placed in the hands of the Committee of the House of Commons at Grocers' Hall. Such proceedings are ominous, and we cannot wonder to find them followed not long after by meetings in great numbers of the trained band and volunteer companies at Dunmow. Presently the King denounces those opposed to him as "rebels;" tumults arise (Colchester was the scene of some of these precursors of the impending strife), and the civil war began.

When the Committees were formed for removing scandalous ministers, it was a natural reaction that in Essex, where the hierarchy had ruled with oppressive and unsparing power, many sequestrations were made. In an Appendix to his seventh chapter, nearly forty pages are occupied by Mr. Davids with the names of the sequestered clergy, and a statement of the charges brought against them by their parishioners and neighbours. Making, as we perhaps ought to do, a liberal allowance for the cases resting merely on malignant village gossip, and which could be at any time got up against unpopular clergymen, we are bound to say that in the majority of cases where any details are given, there appear to be valid grounds for censuring and suspending the incumbents. The list contains nearly 150 cases of sequestration. In forty-six of the places where these sequestrations occurred, the clergy who took the livings were afterwards ejected either by the re-appearance of the sequestered ministers at the Restoration or by their own Nonconformity in 1662.

In 1646, a petition was presented to the Lords from the counties of Essex and Suffolk, praying for the speedy organization of Presbyterian discipline. This, with many other facts which this volume contains, conspires to shew that Independency, though now the dominant and almost sole phase of Nonconformity in the county of Essex, has played the part of the lean kine in Pharaoh's dream, and swallowed up the others; but in using the similitude, we would not imply that Independency is "ill favored, and such as was never seen in Egypt for *badness*." In truth, in reading the religious history of that day, our sympathies run much more freely with the early Independents than with their rivals of the other sect, whose intolerance was gross and utterly without defence.

Presbyterian government was established by parliamentary ordinance in June, 1646. The Essex presbytery consisted of no less than fourteen classes, which had their central stations at Braintree, Chelmsford, Rotchford, Harlow, and other places.

The Essex Testimony, signed by one hundred and twenty-seven ministers of the county, ranks with other so-called testimonies to the truth of Jesus in theological bitterness and in the violation of the principle of religious liberty. They say that "tender consciences of *Dissenting brethren* should be tenderly dealt

withall;" but presently there follows this specimen of their tender mercy:

"We do solemnlie and sincerelie professe, as in the presence of Almightie God, the searcher and judge of all hearts, that from our soules we do utterly detest and abhor, as all former cursed doctrines of *Popery*, *Arminianisme*, and *Socinianisme*, so likewise, the damnable errors and blasphemies of these present evill times, whether of *Anti-scripturists*, *Famulists*, *Antinomians*, *Anti-Trinitarians*, *Arians*, *Anabaptists*, or whatsoever else is found contrary to sound doctrine, and the power of godlinesse."—Pp. 308, 309.

We presume Mr. Davids scarcely conceives this document to be penned in an "evangelical" spirit, as he begins the chapter by the remark that "the supremacy of the Presbyterians proved to be only not as inimical to religious liberty as that of the Prelatists had been." Passages like that quoted shew that the Presbyterians of the 17th century needed all the lessons of that stern discipline through which they had to pass after the Restoration to enable them to understand, teach and uphold religious liberty.

Of the proceedings of the Nonconformists of Essex during the years when episcopacy was itself persecuted, Mr. Davids has not given us much information that is new. It is to be regretted that the minutes of the presbyteries and classes have been for the most part lost. The writer who would collect and publish such portions of these documents as survive, would add an important chapter to the history of religion in this country.* We can well understand, when we recall the spirit of the Stuarts and their counsellors, how it came to pass that documents of this kind were early suppressed and destroyed. Many, both of the clergy and laity, recollected with resentment harassing proceedings of the presbyteries, and would have been not unwilling to retaliate on any one whom they could by legal evidence identify with the religious oppressors of the Commonwealth times.

Mr. Davids introduces his Memorials of the ejected clergy with these pertinent remarks:

"Without the pale of the establishment, the Nonconformists soon escaped a world of prejudices which had painfully entangled them before, and mingling now with others, who, throughout the struggle in which they had thus been worsted, had displayed a heroism even greater than their own, they bore no humble part in rearing up that noble edifice of

* Of the Manchester classis the minutes are preserved, and belong to the trustees of Cross-Street chapel, Manchester. The minutes of the proceedings of one of the London classes are in the possession of Mrs. James Aspinall Turner, having descended to her from her ancestor, Rev. William Blackmore, who acted as scribe. The minutes of the Cheshire classis after the Revolution are in the possession of Rev. Henry Green, of Knutsford, and those of the Liverpool classis are preserved in the library attached to Renshaw-Street chapel in Liverpool. Doubtless a skilful searcher might soon find other materials not less valuable than these.

religious liberty which has since become the glory and the bulwark of their country, and the hope and admiration of the world."—Pp. 334, 335.

Few portions of Calamy's great work are more manifestly defective than those in his "Account" and "Continuation" in which he treats of the ejected ministers of Essex. In his earlier work we find biographical particulars of comparatively few—20 or 25 out of nearly 120; the rest is a mere list of names. When he published his "Continuation" he was able to supply many additional lives and facts. Mr. Samuel Palmer, in his "Nonconformists' Memorial," did little to enrich the history of the Essex Bartholomeans, and did not always in his amalgamation of Calamy's two works take care to preserve all the facts they contain. A considerable harvest, therefore, awaited any painstaking editor. We accept with satisfaction the sheaves which Mr. Davids has brought into the granary; they might have been more numerous: at all events, there is much yet to reward the historical gleaner.

Our author has followed Calamy's and Palmer's plan of arranging his biographies under the heads of the places whence they were ejected, which are arranged alphabetically. A more instructive arrangement would be to group the places together according to their geographical vicinity. If the alphabet is to rule the order, it were better to arrange the list, dictionary fashion, in the order of the names of persons, and to give afterwards a full index of places, the want of which in respect to Calamy many readers have felt. The local index of Mr. Davids' work is very useful; but the list of names of persons is imperfect and of little use.

We have in these Memorials first of all an account of the ministers actually silenced or ejected in the county of Essex; then of those who, though once settled in the county, were ejected elsewhere; then of ministers whose only tie to the county is their nativity in it; and the whole is concluded by accounts of ministers who, ejected elsewhere, afterwards settled or laboured in Essex. We have altogether particulars of 180 of the 2000 ejected ministers. Of those actually silenced or ejected in Essex, the more celebrated names are those of Owen Stockton, of Colchester; Matthew Newcomen, of Dedham; Edmund Calamy, of Moreton (the father of the Bartholomean biographer); Giles Firmin, of Shalford; Thomas Horrocks, of Maldon; William Rathband, of South Weald; John Cole, of Wethersfield; and Robert Billio, of Wickham Bishops. The lists which follow contain names still more illustrious, such as John Owen, the elder Calamy, William Bridge, of Yarmouth, William Jenkin, John Collinges, and Ray, the naturalist.

Few worthier names are inscribed in the roll of Nonconformists than Owen Stockton, born at Ely and educated at Cambridge. No sooner had he taken his degree than he created,

without waiting for preferment, opportunities of preaching the gospel.

"'His manner was at first to enquire out what small parishes, within ten or fifteen miles of Cambridge, were destitute of ministers: unto these he went and preached, and that with such privacy, as for some while none knew of it but himself and the parishioners to whom he went; and to many of them it was a long time unknown either who he was or from whence he came. This service he performed gratis, neither expecting nor receiving any worldly reward.' In these itinerant labours he met with great acceptance and realized great usefulness, particularly, it is said, at Burwell, Swaffham, Soham, Land-Beach, and Chesterton, in Cambridgeshire; Debenham, in Suffolk; and Wethersfield, in Essex." * * *

"Stockton's reputation as a preacher continuing to increase, in 1657, he was invited by the mayor, Thomas Laurence, and the corporation of Colchester, to occupy the post so ably filled in former years by Northye, Ames, Bridge, and John Knowles. This invitation he accepted after much and anxious deliberation. 'It fared with him at Colchester as it did at Cambridge. He thought he did not work enough, and he therefore asked leave, and freely offered himself, to preach also on the Lord's day mornings at St. James' church, not desiring any outward reward for it; which was granted and accepted. He was to this place a very great blessing; and here he laboured in the word and doctrine, till by the Act of Uniformity he was, with the rest of his brethren, debarred from the public exercises of the ministry. Yet, not thinking himself bound to be his own executioner, and there being mutual obligations by contract between the town and him, that the one should not eject, nor the other desert, without so long warning, he did, after the fatal Bartholomew, continue his publick preaching some time, till, having occasion to take a journey into Cambridge, in his absence another was put into his place by Sheldon.' This other was Richard Pulley, who was already admitted to the rectory of Fordham, on the ejectment of John Bulkley, and who undertook the lecture at the command of Sheldon, in a letter dated December 20, 1662. After his return from Cambridgeshire, Stockton opened his own house for public worship to those who were desirous of enjoying the continuance of his ministry. For this, as might have been expected, he was soon and frequently involved in trouble."—Pp. 366, 367.

Some of the MSS. of this good man, including his diary, are preserved in Dr. Williams's Library. Mr. Davids has made good use of the diary.

"April 16, 1665, he thus writes: 'It being a time of danger as to ye keeping of my meeting service, many souldiers being in ye towne, I being dubious whether I should admit ye people to come or no, when I considered that Christ took it as an act of love to feed his sheep—John xxi. 5—that he exposed himself to death to save mee, I being under a sense of the comfort that the Lord had given mee in the morning, in my meditation on 1 Tim. i. 15, I was willing to adventure myself upon the providence of God.' While the authorities were thus intent on the silencing of Stockton, and the dispersion of his flock, so great was the dearth of preaching that, as appears from an entry in the Assembly Book, under date May 23, 1665, they urged Pulley, the lecturer, on that

ground, to preach there 'as well on Sundays as on Wednesdays in the forenoon, if it may stand with his convenience,' promising him an addition of fifty pounds to his yearly income if he would consent to their proposal. June 22, of the same year, Stockton writes: 'As I was exercising in my family, in the afternoon, severall of my friends being with me, I had word sent me that Sir J(ohn) S(haw), the recorder; the mayor, Thomas Wade; and justices, would come down to my house. Whereupon I, being near the end of my exercise, concluded with a short prayer. After I (had) done, and dismissed the people, one of the constables came to me and told me he was sent to dissolve my meeting, and had some kind of trembling upon him when he spoke to me, and said he blessed God that had given him an heart to come sometimes himselfe, and his wife, to my meetings, so that instead of doing me any hurt, he gave glory to God for giving him an heart to be present.'"—Pp. 367, 368.

When persecutions increased, Mr. Stockton found an asylum at Chatsham, in Suffolk, where his brother-in-law, John Meadows, the ejected minister of Ousden, was residing on his patrimonial estate. From that quiet haven he from time to time went forth into the neighbouring counties of Essex and Cambridge, and re-animated by his fervent and faithful preaching the fainting spirits of the persecuted people whom he addressed. When the Indulgence of 1672 came out, Owen Stockton took out a licence at Ipswich and also at Colchester, at both which places he officiated. At both the spirit of religious liberty was strong. Long before this, the people of Colchester had been described to Laud by one of his creatures as "like them of Ephesus. *Their Diana* is their liberty." Owen Stockton was not one of those whose privilege it was to ride out the long storm of persecution, and to reach the safe and abiding harbour which the Revolution provided. He died in 1680. Acts of Uniformity and ejectments had not obliterated his affection to his alma mater, for he bequeathed his books to the library of Gonville and Caius College, and £500 for the foundation of a scholarship in the same college. Such were the men whom in their passionate rage Sheldon and his coadjutors drove out of a Church which they loved, and which their virtues would have adorned.

Another good man was Thomas Horrocks, of Maldon. He was of Bolton, in Lancashire. Though of burning zeal, it was, says Calamy, a distinguishing part of his character "that he loved all good people, how much soever they differed in opinion from him."

"'After his ejectment he continued to preach, and was at length cast into the dungeon of the town prison, where he lay ten days. His wife went to London to wait on the King and Council, and the Earl of Manchester, and the Lord Roberts, who were his friends, and obtained a 'habeas corpus' to remove him, to the great mortification of his adversaries. A court being called in the town, he was accused of all sorts of crimes, and called by some of the aldermen, heretick, schismatick, and

traitor; and when he was pleading for himself, one of them rose from the bench and gave him a box on the ear, and beat off his satin cap. He stooped down to take it up again, and thanked the boisterous gentleman. They told him if he must be gone, he should hire his own horse, or go on foot, but he told them he had done nothing against the King or Government, and therefore they should take care to send him, for he could not walk nor hire an horse. They at length sent him on horseback, with a sergeant on each side of him, through all the towns like a criminal, and Mr. Hart, that struck him, followed to prosecute him. He was brought before Judge Mallet, who, though severe enough of himself, yet as God ordered it, was pretty favourable to him. He reproved the alderman, saying, he thought his prisoner looked like a very honest gentleman and deserved no such treatment. To which he answered, that he was a pestilent fellow, and had preached to five hundred at once, through the gate of his prison, but the Sunday before. The judge said this was a sign he was well-beloved, and he acquitted him. But the furious bailiff went and entered his action in the Crown Office, so that, though it was eight at night, he was forced to go to Romford, which cost him a violent fit of sickness. He was harassed from one court to another for three assizes, and his life was threatened, but some gentlemen that were his friends solicited Sir Orlando Bridgman, who was the judge, and his countryman; he at last was cleared, and some of the judges came down from the bench and embraced him. After a great many fatigues, he at last settled at Battersea, in Surrey, where he boarded and taught young gentlemen.'

"There is the following notice of Horrocks in an account of 'Informations of Meetings in Hertfordshire,' dated January 2, 1664. 'Horrex, late vicar of Maldon, in Essex, who hath bin severall times indited at ye assize in that county for holding conventicles, is now preacher to ye Anabaptists of Hertford, who meete on Sundaye at ye house of one Herles, a ffarmer, cald Brickingtonbury, to ye number of 500 at a time, from ye parts there about. These talke high yt the time of their liberty draweth neare. . . . . And Horrexe, aforesaid, is to them as one of ye furys to spurn them onward. He p(rea)ches to them, yt he comes not to them with a sermon out of a booke, but with that which the Lord hath spoken to him: viz., yt theye must not goe back nor bee daunted with any terrour, lest God spue them out of his mouth.'"—Pp. 424, 425.

When the Revolution came, the Dissenters of Maldon built a chapel, and, as Mr. Horrocks was dead, they secured the services of another of the ejected clergy, Mr. Joseph Billio. The next minister but one at Maldon was Rev. Lawrence Holden, the father of an honoured minister of the same name at Tenterden. This fact, taken in connection with the known heresy of the Holdens, shews how soon Antitrinitarian sentiments had found their way into English Nonconformist churches.

Some of the names given by Calamy are properly omitted by Mr. Davids. Thus Benjamin Way, whose name is associated in the older works with Barking, was in reality ejected in Dorsetshire, having left Barking some years before the passing of the Act of Uniformity. He was afterwards a preacher to the Independent congregation established at Castle Green, Bristol. In

like manner the name of Mr. Wells, of Hornchurch, is removed from the list of the ejected ministers. He enjoyed his vicarage till his death in 1686.

On the other hand, some additions have to be made to the Essex list. There was a zealous Nonconformist minister of the name of Isaiah Archer, who was connected for more than twenty years as a lecturer with Halsted and Colchester. He was the son of William Archer (also a minister, we believe), of Epping, and he had an elder brother who was well reputed as a Nonconformist in London, at Hertford and Arnheim. Some notices of him occur in an interesting MS., only recently thrown open to the public eye, in the British Museum, in the collections of the late Rev. Joseph Hunter. (Additional MSS., 24,485.) Isaiah Archer had a conformist son who officiated at Mildenhall, Spinney and Wicken, whose diary, more amusing than edifying, gives these and other particulars of the Nonconformist branches of his family. Mr. Davids mentions a Thomas Archer as ejected from Chickney, in Essex. As early as 1644, a person of the same name was cited before a court at Dunmow for holding conventicles.

Mr. Davids might also have enriched his account of Francis Chandler, ejected at Theydon Mount, by extracts from the diary of this worthy man, which, in addition to the proofs of his love of liberty, his singleness of aim, and his zeal in preaching and keeping fast-days with his persecuted brethren in Essex, shews that he was kindly treated by his former rector at Theydon, Baron Hill, the Countess of Carlisle, Lord Grey of Groby and others. The diary records his farewell sermon at Garnon (which he also served), Aug. 17, 1662. "Prædicabam apud Garnon ambobus diei vicibus, in Heb. xiii. 20, 21, quando ultimum vale iis dedi populo multum lacrymis dolorem exponenti, Ebenezer," &c. &c. We learn from this diary that one of the early places of meeting of the Nonconformists of Essex was Moultso Hall.

In one of his lists Mr. Davids has the name of John Knowles, ejected from Bristol cathedral. He decides that this is a different person from John Knowles the Socinian (and he is probably right on this point), but he does not mention the grounds of his opinion. He might have added largely to his account of William Blackmore, the ejected minister of St. Peter's, Cornhill, had he consulted the Blackmore Papers which we were so fortunate as to preserve in a former volume of the *Christian Reformer*, and which have since been reprinted. He might also have enriched his account of the two Angiers by references to articles which have appeared in our pages and in Mr. Booker's account of Denton as one of the chapelries of Manchester.

One department of Mr. Davids' labours has been to identify the old seats of Nonconformity in the county with places of

worship still kept up amongst the Dissenters. This is an interesting branch of the subject. But his attempt to give the succession of ministers in the several places has overladen his pages with mere unsuggestive lists of names, and made portions of his book unreadable.

There was during the last century a Presbyterian chapel at Brentwood, which had a succession of Arian pastors, one of whom was Rev. James Pickbourne. Mr. Davids mentions a curious circumstance connected with the pastor of this church in 1707, Gabriel Barbor: he continued in the pastorate till 1750.

"He was a lineal descendant of John Barbor, who had been condemned to be burnt at Smithfield, in the reign of Mary. While John Barbor was taking leave of his friends, the news came that the Queen was dead. On the accession of Elizabeth he was released from prison, and lived to a good old age. In memory of this merciful escape, he caused a jewel to be made, consisting of a cameo portrait of Queen Elizabeth, set in gold, with a circle of rubies and diamonds, and having attached to it a pendant of pearls. This jewel, together with a miniature of himself, and a document relating to the facts, enclosed in a box, he bequeathed to his nearest of kin, from time to time, who should have a daughter named Elizabeth. It thus came into the possession of Gabriel Barbor, from whom, at his decease, it descended to his son John, under the following deed: 'And be it known to all whom it may concern, that I, Gabriel Barbor, of Brentwood, do give after my decease, the aforesaid jewel, together with the portrait of the said Mr. Barbor, unto John, my eldest son, provided he have a daughter named Elizabeth, and he is also to give the said jewel and picture to his son on the foregoing condition. But if the said condition be not fulfilled in my son John, then the said jewel and picture shall go to my second son, Gabriel; and in case of a failure here in this son, then the said jewel and picture shall descend to Richard, my third son, he performing the said condition. But should neither of my sons have a daughter named Elizabeth, then my mind and will is that the said jewel and picture go to my son John, and his male heirs for ever. In witness whereof I set my hand, the 25th of August, 1724.' The treasure came into the possession of Elizabeth, wife of Prescott Blencowe, of Rayne, and daughter of Gabriel's third son, Richard, towards the close of the last century. It is now in the possession of a daughter of Mrs. Blencowe, who bears the prescribed christian name." Pp. 411, 412.

It is an interesting fact that the two men whose genius, piety and zeal have wrought such wonderful results on the religious mind of England in the last century, viz., Isaac Watts by his Psalms and Hymns, and John Wesley by his missionary agencies, derived their inspiration from a Nonconformist source,—the poet from his father, who was a sufferer for conscience' sake in the Stuart persecution, and the founder of Methodism from his grandfather, the ejected minister of Whitchurch, in Dorsetshire. John Wesley, the ejected minister, was for some time in the early period of his life a preacher in Essex. The account of

him in the volume before us is mainly supplied by Rev. George Maxwell, the present vicar of Whitchurch.

"He was the son of Bartholomew Westley, a well-known minister at Charmouth; father of Samuel Westley, rector of Ormesby, Epworth, in the county of Lincoln; and the grandfather of the devoted John and Charles Wesley, so deservedly honoured as the founders of Methodism. He was educated at New Inn Hall, Oxford, and was not above two and twenty years of age when he began to preach. He was for some time labouring at Stanway, in this county. The rectory had been sequestered from 'Samuel Baldock to the use of Philip Pinckney,' who is described as a 'plundered minister,' when he was still 'on his way home.' As Pinckney, who was the father of John Pinckney, afterwards ejected from Langstock, in the county of Hants, preferred to return to his old living of Denton, in Wilts, where he had been deprived before his exile, the sequestration was transferred to John Westley. This was October 30, 1645.

"Westley remained at Stanway until 1650, when he is named in the Parliamentary return. At what date he left Stanway does not appear. According to Walker, John Okeley succeeded to the living in 1654, about which time, it should appear, that Westley married a niece of the well-known Thomas Fuller. Westley had a numerous family. I am favoured with copies of the entries of the baptisms of Timothy, April 17, 1659; Elizabeth, January 29, 1660; and Samuel, the father of John and Charles, December 17, 1662. He seems to have been early involved in trouble at the restoration, in consequence of some scruples about taking the oaths of 'allegiance and supremacy.' For this he was put in prison. Early in 1662 he was again in trouble, and was imprisoned a second time; it is not very clear for what offence, but possibly as being still suspected of disaffection to Charles. In his examination before Gilbert Ironside, bishop of Bristol, he speaks of having 'suffered for imprudencies in matters civil,' and having received his Majesty's full pardon. In the February after his ejectment he removed to Melcombe, but the corporation by some means preventing his settlement there, he removed successively to Ilminster, Bridgewater, and Taunton, in all of which places he seems to have been disturbed, and finally settled at Preston. Here his labours were incessant, and the success that followed on his ministry was most remarkable. He formed religious societies in several places in the neighbourhood, Hutchins says, 'particularly at Radispole, Melcombe, Tamworth, and Whitchurch.' His conduct, indeed, presents a kind of epitome of Methodism; his mode of preaching, matter, manner, and success being most strikingly similar to that of his grandson. Calamy says, that 'notwithstanding all his prudence in encouraging his meetings more privately than most of his brethren, he was oft disturbed, several times apprehended, and four times imprisoned; once at Poole for half a year, and once at Dorchester for three months; but the other confinements were not so long. He was in many straits and difficulties, but wonderfully supported and comforted, and many times very seasonably and surprisingly relieved and delivered. And having filled up his part of what is behind of the afflicting of Christ in his flesh, for his body's sake, which is the church, and finished the work given him to do, he was like all this vale of tears.' The date of his death is supposed to have been about 1670."—Pp. 575—577.

We have devoted as large a space as we can conveniently spare to Mr. Davids' volume, because it points the way in some respects to the best mode of illustrating Nonconformist history, and also because it bears internal traces of great labour on the editor's part. Still we wish he had done yet more to make his book perfect. It is but a collection of materials for a history rather than a history. We feel the want of a discriminating essay, either by way of introduction or as a summary and comment at the close, elucidating the essential principles of Nonconformity, and shewing where our honoured fathers fell short of that at which they doubtless aimed.

Nor can we close the volume without expressing the misgiving that as it was with them so it is with many of their descendants. They mar the integrity of their Nonconformity and their allegiance to religious liberty by their fears for orthodoxy, their own or other men's.

In Mr. Davids' title we have the qualifying word "Evangelical," which may mean only that which every man who believes the gospel of Jesus Christ values; but it is a word which, as some men use it—an implied assertion of infallibility—is as narrowing and exclusive as other men's articles and creeds. Let the annals of Nonconformity be well pondered, and let the principle which they teach be faithfully received, and bigotry and intolerance will no more trouble and discredit the descendants of the glorious TWO THOUSAND.

NOTES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

ON the west side of the Temple-yard of Jerusalem there were under the monarchy, and yet are, four gates. These lead to the city, or more exactly two to the city of Zion and two to the suburb or new city built by David. Between, however, the west side of the Temple-yard and the inhabited parts of the city is a narrow deep gulley, along which a steep road runs from the middle of the city down into the valley of the Siloam. This road is so steep, that the four western gates of the Temple-yard open upon it at very different heights. Through the most northerly gate, the path reaches the suburb over ground not far from level. Through the most southerly gate, on the other hand, the path once reached the city of Zion by a bridge thrown over the steep road or gulley. Through each of the two intermediate gates the path reached the steep road by a sharp descent, and probably by a flight of steps, of which the most southerly would have more steps than the other. Thus of the four western gates, one opened upon the city of Zion by a bridge, the second upon the steep road by a flight of steps, and the third and fourth

upon the suburb, one by the help of steps and one by level ground. After these remarks we shall better understand 1 Chron. xxvi. 16, 18:

"To Shuppim and Hosah [the lot for the wardships came forth] westward, with the gate of Shallecheth [or the Bridge], and by the flight of steps of the steep road, ward jointly with ward. At Parbar [or the suburb] westward, four at the flight of steps and two at Parbar."

The word Shallecheth does not occur elsewhere in the Bible; but as it is derived from a verb meaning to throw, it may not improbably mean the bridge thrown over the deep narrow valley which separates the Temple-yard from the city of Zion.

---

2 Chron. iii. 3: "The length by cubits after the longer measure was threescore cubits."

The Hebrews, like the Egyptians, had two cubits, a longer and a shorter. The longer contained a cubit and a handbreadth, and is the measure here spoken of. The Authorized Version calls it the "first measure," and it might be translated the "ancient measure," except that it was the more modern of the two. It was first in importance, not in age, and was called by the Egyptians the royal measure.

---

2 Chron. iii. 5: "And the Great Hall he coated with fir-timber."

The House of Jehovah had only two rooms, the Great Hall here spoken of, called the Greater House, and the smaller chamber behind, which should be called in ver. 16, the "place of the Oracle," and in ver. 8, the "chamber of the Holy of the Holies," and in 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, the "chamber of the cover of the Ark." In all these places the Authorized Version should be corrected, as also in iii. 17, iv. 7, 22, where the Great Hall is in the Authorized Version called the Temple, while the description of it plainly shews that it is only the first of the two chambers of the House of the Lord.

---

2 Chron. vi. 32: "If they, the strangers, come and pray toward this House."

The Authorized Version has, "pray in this House," which is opposed both by the Hebrew text and by the customs of the country. The worshipers, whether Israelites or strangers, stood in the Temple-yard in the open air and prayed toward the House.

---

2 Chron. vii. 9: "And on the eighth day they kept a Day of Restraint; for they kept the dedication of the altar seven days, even the Feast seven days; and on the three-and-twentieth day of the seventh month he sent the people away."

The Authorized Version has, "and the feast seven days," making fourteen days in all, which is contradicted by the words

that follow, as the people were assembled to the Feast of Tabernacles on the fifteenth day of the month, and dismissed on the twenty-third. Moreover, the Hebrew word for "dedication" of the sacred building might not improperly be translated a "handseling;" not a special ceremony, but the first time it was used for one of the ordinary ceremonies. Again, the Authorized Version has "a solemn assembly," instead of a day of restraint; but this was the one fast-day of the Jews, mentioned in Acts xxvii. 9.

---

2 Chron. xxiv. 27: "Now concerning his sons and the greatness of the tribute laid upon him, and the foundation of the house of God, behold they are written in the history of the Book of the Kings."

The Authorized Version has, the "repairing of the house of God," which this chapter tells us was the work of this king's minority. But this verse gives us the further information that the repair included the making or strengthening the foundations; and this is particularly interesting to us, because the massive stones of the foundation are still the admiration of our travellers, as they were of the Saviour and his disciples. See Mark xiii. 1.

Nehemiah vi. 10: "I came unto the house of Shemaiah, who would be in bondage."

The Authorized Version has, "who was shut up;" but the word is of frequent occurrence in the phrase, "bond-man and free-man," and it is here used to describe one of the Jews of the slavish party who did not wish to join his countrymen in their attempts to become independent of Persia.

Ezra ii. 6: "Pachath-moab."

The name of this Israelite in the Authorized Version is "Pahath-moab." The change is very slight, but it is all that we can make as an approach towards shewing that it meant the Pachah or Pasha of Moab. He had held the rank of Pachah of the province of Moab under the Persians, and had thence adopted the title as his proper name.

Ezra viii. 27: "Two vessels of fine yellow copper [or brass], precious as gold."

This is the earliest mention of brass in the Jewish history: in every earlier book the word brass of the Authorized Version ought to be changed into copper.

---

2 Chron. xxxv. 25: "And Jeremiah sang a lamentation for Josiah."

The Authorized Version has, "Jeremiah lamented for Josiah," which is very far from expressing the same meaning.

S. S.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Life and Times of the Right Hon. Sir James R. Graham, Bart., G.C.B., M.P. By Torrens M'Cullagh Torrens, late M.P., Author of the Industrial History of Free Nations, &c. Two vols. 8vo. Saunders, Otley and Co.

This is an honest and sterling biography of one of our recent statesmen, the material out of which English history is hereafter to be written. However hotly the battle of Party may be fought, and however hard the blows we give to those opposed to us in this warfare while it is going on, Englishmen are not only prepared to do justice to the character of their departed statesmen, with whomsoever they may have been allied, but are disposed to regard with becoming pride, as the nation's true wealth, whatever was admirable in their talents or noble in their character.

The late Sir James Graham was a man of great activity of mind, of boundless powers of work, essentially patriotic in his aspirations, a good speaker, possessing great personal recommendations, and yet his success in public life was less than that of many men far less gifted than himself. He was better qualified to play the second than the leading part. As a leader he had too little hopefulness to manifest that confidence which is needful to inspire a man's followers with enthusiasm. He had, too, defects of temper which told greatly against him in public life. His pride sometimes stood in the way not only of concessions, but of explanations essential for his own justification. Beneath a proud exterior there were too strong personal affections at work, which, if they gave depth and energy to his character, sometimes disturbed his judgment and made his course of action deflect from the straight line of consistency. The leadership of Lord Stanley (now the Earl of Derby), which he faithfully followed during some of the best years of his public life, was injurious to him, in the estimation of a large body of his countrymen. It is singular how capricious for a time the world's judgments seem to be with regard to public men. What one man does with impunity, is in another a grave offence. Sir James Graham, in his changes of opinion and party, was treated with general severity, while his more adroit and graceful leader always retained his popularity. Sir James Graham's abandonment of the Liberal party in 1834 on the Church question, was in some degree brought about by his attachment and reverence for his mother. Lady Catherine Graham was a sincere and thoroughly religious Churchwoman, and any attack on the principle of the Establishment seemed to her an act of desecration. Her praise, often reserved, made her son's heart throb with a joyful pride. But English statesmen should be made of sterner stuff than to let feelings and the praise of women affect state policy. Sir James Graham made some serious mistakes, for which he was sternly punished both in Parliament and by the press. But his administrative talents were of a very high order, and seldom have the affairs of the Admiralty and the Home Office been more ably conducted than during his tenure of them. He was never found unprepared; and if his demeanour in the committee-room or to a deputation was reserved and haughty, no one left his presence without the feeling that Sir James Graham understood the subject

better than most around him, and that he could not be diverted from the path he thought right. Few persons realize the amount of toil through which our leading public men have to pass to keep a foremost place. The inexhaustible animal spirits of Lord Palmerston, and the affectation of idleness of the late Lord Melbourne, may have given apparent countenance to the idea that high official station may be combined with ease and the gratification of a minister's personal tastes. Sir Robert Peel once gave utterance to the sentiment that the position of Prime Minister in England was the *weightiest* as well as the noblest trust which could devolve on man. Sir James Graham shared the sentiment, and in his secondary post gave his whole strength to its duties. Peel and Graham mutually admired and wondered at the other's power of work.

"A friend (Mr. J. C. Colquhoun) who happened to breakfast with Sir James one morning in Hill Street, was so struck by the singular abstemiousness of his repast, which consisted of a cup of tea and a biscuit, that he ventured to expostulate with him on the subject. But he was not to be shaken in his notions regarding spare diet, which he said 'was essential to the preservation of his capacity for labour, such as that which he had to undergo. For any one who was subject to gout, and who could not find time for out-of-door exercise, there was nothing for it but to live low, if he would retain his capacity for mental work.' He never ate luncheon, and his only meal was dinner, which he generally took at eight o'clock. The number of hours he devoted to business, was in truth greater than his constitution could bear with impunity. Not only were his days unintermittingly spent at the Home Office, or in the House of Commons, but many of the hours which ought to have been given to sleep, were added by him to the long working-day. He went comparatively little into society, and when he did, returned home early, that he might devote two or three hours to his papers, before retiring to rest. He was not content until he had read every report in print or manuscript, as well as the evidence on which it was founded, which related to the business of his department, or to questions, which he anticipated might be raised in any form, in the House of Commons. Every new book and pamphlet, that could suggest arguments or ideas, was to be found upon his table; and the margins of their pages attested the attention with which they had been read. He kept everything,—letters, memoranda, copies of official minutes, excerpts from speeches, resolutions of public meetings, passages from leading articles, comparative statistics, and casual publications of innumerable kinds. He seldom went to the House of Commons unarmed with, what he used playfully to call, his revolvers. By these he meant the envelopes, in which he placed the materials for defence of his opinions, upon the variety of subjects which he anticipated might arise in debate. Each contained the leading arguments on both sides; and the reasons which decided his own judgment. Many of them were of course never used, as their endorsements still attest. But the habit of preparation became such, that to the latest period of his life he never left it off. 'I have seen him,' says one who sat with him many years in Opposition, 'come down to the House night after night, with his packets of parliamentary combustibles; draw his well-filled envelope from his pocket, as each new topic turned up, go through its contents, and then lay it on the seat beside him;—do this afresh two or three times in the course of the evening, and then quietly go away without having once opened his lips."—II. 400—402.

It is not our intention to go into the details of Sir James Graham's public life. Were we to make the attempt, we should, while conceding to him invariable ability and honesty of purpose, often record our disapprobation of his course, especially in respect to educational and ecclesiastical legislation. It is to his credit that he was always desirous of

preventing religious strife, and that generally his measures tended to this end. His treatment of the ecclesiastical affairs of Scotland previous to the disruption of the Free Church may be alleged as contradicting this. On that occasion he was misled by false statements and by the shallow views of those who could not measure the irresistible enthusiasm of the national character where religious susceptibilities were affected. His biographer tells us that he looked back with regret on the course adopted in 1843, and he was convinced that he had, in deference to the judgment of others, fallen into a serious error. Those who do not share the love of an Established Church which influenced Sir James Graham, may see little cause to regret the fruits of a policy which demonstrated that religion may in certain cases thrive better without than with the aid of the State, and that religious parties, like the roots of seed corn, may grow up all the healthier and stronger for being separated.

Sir James Graham is one of that band of honest and brave statesmen to whom we owe the Dissenters' Chapels Act. When, in 1843, orthodox relators, both in Ireland and England, were hovering on and harassing the flank of Unitarians occupying Presbyterian endowments, the English Presbyterian Union sent a deputation to the Home Office to state their case and ask relief. The deputation consisted of four gentlemen, of whom Mr. James Esdaile is the sole survivor; the other members were the late Mr. G. W. Wood, M.P., Mr. Benjamin Wood, M.P., and Rev. Robert Aspland. The interview with Sir James Graham was thus briefly described in Mr. Aspland's diary, April 28: "To Sir James Graham, at Home Office, at one. Most satisfactory interview. Sir James understands the question, and is apparently with us, and will move the Cabinet, and promises we shall have an assurance from the Government in about a week." It will be seen from the extract we now make from Mr. Torrens' second volume that almost the whole credit of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill is claimed for Sir James Graham.

"One of the thorniest subjects of practical legislation which Government had to grasp, was the doubtful condition of property vested in Unitarian trustees, for religious and charitable uses. By the statute of Uniformity passed soon after the Restoration, no gift was legal for religious or charitable uses, if made to any congregation other than one belonging to the Church of England. The Toleration Act of William III. exempted Trinitarian Nonconformists, being Protestants, from the disability, but left the Catholics and Unitarians as they were before. During the next century, bequests in their favour could not legally be made *eo nomine*, to their use. But in 1813 the latter were relieved, prospectively, and thenceforth property might legally be devoted by gift or bequest, to the support of Unitarian chapels or schools. The same benefit was conferred upon the Catholics by emancipation, both retrospectively and prospectively. The only exception still outstanding, therefore, to the comprehensive justice of toleration, was that which left endowments under deeds of gift, which did not specify sectarian tests of application, to be interpreted by courts of equity as they might deem fit, on the doubtful balance of proof as to the opinions of the donor: although the effect of such decision might be to divest a congregation of the place of worship, the cemetery, and the school-house they had uninterruptedly held for fifty years. Angry and costly litigation had been carried on in the courts of law and of equity, on this subject, for a considerable time. The highest judges differed respecting the construction of the law of religious trusts; and it was to quench doubts, and quiet possession as to this species of property, without regard to opinions, that Parliament was called on to interpose by way of legislation. Lords Lyndhurst, Cottenham, Brougham, Denman, and Campbell had united in recommending

Government to bring in a bill on the subject. This they resolved to do; and the First Minister informed the House, that a measure had been prepared to secure to all congregations the undisturbed possession of their places of worship, and of the charities held by them without interruption for five-and-twenty years, whatever might be the tenets their ministers taught. The Solicitor-General would explain, he said, on the second reading, the provisions of the bill. Sir William Follett, who had but recently resumed his attendance in Parliament after prolonged illness, listened to the announcement with surprise; and on being asked in private in the course of the same evening, some question with regard to the proposed measure, he replied, 'You know as much of it as I do, for until to-night I never heard of the bill.' The care of its preparation had in fact principally lain with the Home Secretary. By his language to deputations that had waited upon him officially, and by the earnest expression of his sentiments on the subject in debate, he identified himself fully with the measure, which he believed to be right, though with a certain section of the supporters of Government, he knew it to be far from popular. But he left the credit it won within the walls of Parliament, from an Opposition hard to propitiate, and difficult to please, to Mr. Gladstone, Sir W. Follett, and Sir Robert Peel, who were one and all complimented highly in the House, by their political rivals, for their mode of dealing with the question. After Sir W. Follett's luminous exposition of the existing statute law on the subject, of the conflict of decisions arising out of recent litigation, and of the specific enactment Ministers proposed, Mr. Macaulay said 'he thought it right to declare at once his approbation of so honest and excellent a bill, and his firm conviction that none but the best and purest motives could have led to its being brought forward.' Sir R. Inglis, Mr. Plumptre, and many others, warmly opposed it on the part of the Church; and they spoke the sentiments of a numerous body of Presbyterians and Evangelical Dissenters. Large majorities however appeared to be in its favour; and before the close of the Session it had become law."—II. 277—280.

One or two serious errors taint this narrative. It is all given under the date June 6, 1844. Now the part which the Secretary of State took was rather in the previous year. Then, if ever, the incident occurred of the conversation with Sir William Follett. But the whole story seems to us doubtful, for we have evidence in Mr. Aspland's diary that the English Presbyterian Union was in communication with the Solicitor-General before Feb. 26, 1843. In the month of May in that year a Bill was privately discussed, framed for the relief of the Unitarians by Sir Frederick Pollock, the then Attorney-General. But the course of affairs in Parliament prevented the Government from fulfilling their intention of introducing the Bill.* The Bill of 1844 was different. Sir William Follett was now the Attorney-General, and to him and Lord Cottenham its authorship must, we believe, be ascribed. But it is certain that Mr. Torrens' narrative is in error; for the Bill passed first through the House of Lords, and its character was well known before Sir William Follett (who came from a sick chamber to fulfil this duty) defended in his argumentative and masterly speech the principles on which it had been drawn up. We have only to add on this subject, that Sir James Graham voted in all the four divisions on the Bill. That he did not speak upon it, was another illustration of his frequent silence on topics which he had previously thoroughly mastered.

* Such of our readers as are interested in the subject may find in Sir Robert Peel's speech (Debates on the Bill, p. 191) a statement of what had occurred in 1843, and the course of negociations with the Unitarians both of England and Ireland.

We will not part with this work without commending the instruction given by Sir James Graham to his executors in reference to his official correspondence: "I strictly enjoin that in any selection that may be made for publication, due regard may be paid to my memory, and to the fair fame of those who have corresponded with me, under the sacred bond of mutual confidence, and of those upon whose conduct I may have commented too harshly."

The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, literally and idiomatically translated out of the Original Languages. By Robert Young, Author of several Works in Hebrew, Chaldee, Samaritan, Syriac, Greek, Latin, Gujarati, &c. Edinburgh—Fullarton and Co.

The author of this new version comes before us with an array of testimonials to his competency as a translator of Scripture, such as seldom falls to the lot of any writer in any capacity. The praise bestowed is so elaborate and so cordial as to raise expectations in the reader of the highest character. Thus Dr. Eadie, of Glasgow, Professor of Divinity to the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, tells us that he has "looked into" most of the author's publications, and that he has no hesitation in attesting his "rare familiarity" . . . . "with Hebrew idiom and its peculiar modes of representing thought." Dr. Candlish, the now famous denouncer of Apocryphal quotations, "supposes" that in linguistic acquirements bearing on the interpretation of Scripture, "Mr. Young is almost, if not altogether, unrivalled." The Rev. Dr. M'Caul, of King's College, London, has had the opportunity of informing himself "by oral communication" of Mr. Young's extraordinary attainments in the same branches of learning, and he knows of "no one more eminently qualified for a chair of Hebrew and Oriental languages." The Rev. A. R. Bonar, of Edinburgh, tells us that "Mr. Robert Young has been long known in the world of letters as perhaps the greatest Hebrew and Oriental scholar of our time." This, we confess, is news to us, and takes us a little by surprise; for we had fancied that such Hebraists as Ewald were "perhaps" the greatest scholars of our day in the departments named.

However, such are the testimonials which Mr. Young or his publishers have economically printed on the fly-leaf which closes the New-Testament portion of this work, the only portion which we have seen, and to which accordingly our present notice alone refers. The reader may count on the same fly-leaf no fewer than twenty-four such expressions of approval. After reading many of them through, we may fairly exclaim, Well for the author if the perusal of his translation shall reveal his attainments and accomplishments to the general public as clearly as they are seen by the learned divines who need only to "look into" his works to discern at once their extraordinary merits! Well for the author if the expectations aroused by such testimonials as these are in no way disappointed!

In the face of critical approval so decided, we scarcely feel ourselves free to pronounce an opinion. But certainly it does appear to us that the New-Testament part of this work is not so well translated as it might have been, and as it ought to have been to justify these so carefully published "opinions as to the scholarship of Mr. Young." On the title-page the work is introduced to us with the words "literally and

idiomatically translated." The reader will soon find out that this means less translation into the English idiom than translation with the retention of much of the idiom of the original. We have always understood the duty of a translator to be to render the idioms of the language he translates into equivalent phraseology in the language he uses, so far as to present the author's meaning as correctly and immediately as possible, without the aid of appended notes and comments. Neglecting this rule, he will most probably produce only a barbarous representation in English of the work he translates, giving us a version which is anything but pleasant reading. And this we take to be the fault of Mr. Young's version of the New Testament. He will himself probably regard it as a merit. Our readers shall judge for themselves. For this purpose we add examples of Mr. Young's renderings in the case of two or three well-known passages. Matt. v. 1—8 is thus rendered:

"And having seen the multitudes, he went up to the mountain; and while he sat down, his disciples came to him; and having opened his mouth, he was teaching them, saying, 'Happy the poor in spirit—for theirs is the reign of the heavens. Happy the mourning—for they shall be comforted. Happy the meek—for they shall inherit the land. Happy those hungering and thirsting for righteousness—for they shall be filled. Happy the kind—for they shall find kindness. Happy the clean in heart—for they shall see God.'"

Here, in the last verse, it would have been still more "idiomatical" to have rendered "they shall see the God." We wonder that such an opportunity of literal rendering should be missed, both here and in a multitude of similar cases!

John i. 15—18 reads thus:

"John testifieth concerning him, and hath cried saying, 'This was he of whom I said, He who after me is coming, hath come before me, for he was before me;' and out of his fulness we all received, and grace over against grace; for the law through Moses was given, the grace and the truth through Jesus Christ came; God no one hath ever seen; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father—he declared."

The commencement of Rom. xii. runs thus:

"I entreat you, therefore, brethren, through the compassions of God, to present your bodies a sacrifice—living, holy, acceptable to God—your intelligent service; and be not conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind, for your proving what *is* the will of God—the good and acceptable and perfect. For I say, through the grace which was given to me, to every one who is among you, not to have high thoughts above what he ought to think; but to think so as to be wise, as to each God dealt a measure of faith; for, as in one body we have many members, but all the members have not the same office, so we, the many, one body are in Christ, and members each one of one another."

One other example we take from 1 Cor. xiii., the beginning of the chapter:

"If with the tongues of men and messengers I speak, but have not love, I have become brass sounding, or a cymbal tinkling; and if I have prophecy, and know all the mysteries, and all the knowledge, and if I have all the faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing; and if I give away to feed others all the things belonging to me, and if I give up my body that I may be burned, but have not love, I am profited nothing."

These examples are fair average specimens of the author's mode of translating. Even granting the superior accuracy of such renderings

as compared with the Common Version, it is evident the difference on this ground is hardly worth mentioning; while we have as counterpoise the many Scoticisms (shall we term them?), or rather barbarisms, of this new translation. We cannot see what is gained by the change, while we do see that something is lost. Indeed, we go so far as to say that if any one wished to lessen reverence for the sacred books, and to promote their disuse, either in public or in private, we doubt whether he could take any more effectual course than to substitute such a version as this for that of King James' translators. Of course this feeling of ours may be mere prejudice, the growth of long familiarity with the one version. It is a prejudice, however, of which the vast majority of readers will undoubtedly partake; shewing us the great desirableness, when introducing the necessary corrections into the common translation, of adhering as closely as possible to the style of that time-honoured version—of which it has been so justly observed, that two centuries and a half have given it a prescriptive right, and rendered it sacred to the religious mind of England. (Preface to the Revised Translation of the Old Testament.)

Bicentenary Lecture. By Rev. Edmund Kell. Pp. 16. Whitfield.

Though late in appearing, Mr. Kell's Lecture is a welcome addition to our Bicentenary literature. He speaks on this subject with that unction which belongs to men who talk of deeds in which their own personal ancestors had a share.

"I individually trace my descent on my father's side from the beginning of the last century, to the Presbyterian congregation at Stockton-on-Tees (now Unitarian), from which my grandfather removed to London. On my maternal side to Thomas Delacourt, of Wareham, who, for his brave adherence to Nonconformity, had his goods and furniture thrice exposed to sale in the market-place, though, to the honour of the town be it said, none could be found to purchase them. He afterwards joined William III. at Torbay, and marched with his army to London."—Pp. 11, 12.

Mr. Kell has given in a series of brief but touching anecdotes the best possible illustration of the heroic and self-denying spirit that influenced the ejected clergy; and on this basis he makes an earnest appeal to the churches which now represent them to copy their "noble example."

Mr. Kell notices, what many others amongst us have observed, that recently certain enterprizing Scotch divines, finding themselves too thick on the ground in their native country, have made a raid southwards, have planted their Calvinistic banners among our quiet tents, and though their accent and idiom betray in every word they utter their *Scottish* descent and education, they industriously call themselves *English* Presbyterians. A Scottish Presbyterian in England does not, however, of necessity become an English Presbyterian, any more than one of the strange New Zealand chiefs now exhibiting themselves in England, and using certain Methodist and other chapels as the theatres for their popular performance, are for the nonce English lords.

At Southampton it seems that the Scotch Free Church minister claimed for himself and his flock to be the sole representatives of the English Presbyterians of Southampton. We suppose there is a purpose in this proceeding which time will develop. The Two Denominations of London have taken into partnership with themselves certain minis-

ters whose names have anything but an English sound, in order to restore to themselves the old name of the *Three Denominations*. The gentlemen thus unexpectedly admitted may perhaps begin to believe that they *are* what their brethren call them, English Presbyterians. But this may prove a dangerous game to our English brethren. Possibly their *orthodoxy* may not by and by satisfy a keen theologian fresh from the Calvinistic schools north of the Tweed, and we may have another act or two in the Hewley suit.

Mr. Kell has given as a frontispiece the engraving of his beautiful "Church of the Saviour" at Southampton. He is enabled "to record with deepfelt gratitude to Almighty God the success of the Bicentenary appeal for the extinction of the building debt upon the church." The history of this church is a chapter in Mr. Kell's life and ministry most honourable to him, and we cheerfully congratulate him and his flock on their great and well-deserved success. The publication of this Lecture will add another to existing proofs that the congregation worshiping in this church, though comparatively of recent origin, is "in unison with the old English Presbyterians," and "admits no human creed as a prerequisite to church fellowship." If our neighbours from Scotland will make themselves *free* in this way, we shall be less unwilling to own them as spiritual kinsmen.

A Speech delivered before the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council in the Cause of Wilson v. *Fendall on Appeal from the Arches Court of Canterbury*. By Henry Bristow Wilson, B.D., Vicar of Great Staughton, Hunts, Appellant. 8vo. Pp. 152. London—Longmans. 1863.

This is a very remarkable and interesting document, and is creditable to the talent and moral courage of its author, one of the clerical writers of "Essays and Reviews." It proves that Mr. Wilson acted a prudent part in declining the aid of counsel and prosecuting this appeal in person. He naturally thought that an argument involving almost exclusively theological questions could be discussed better by a clergyman than a layman. Mr. Wilson's position in this appeal is that he, as a minister of the Church of England, is not on all questions dogmatically bound to the symbols of his Church literally and grammatically interpreted; that there is left to him and all clergymen a space for free thought; and that there are many open questions on which he is at liberty to differ both from the Sacerdotal and from the Calvinistic party, who respectively claim to represent the Church of England.

The principal theological topics which Mr. Wilson's argument touches are the inspiration of Scripture, and the salvability of heathens, and, as involved in this topic, the nature of future punishment. He questions the doctrine of plenary inspiration, he pleads for the salvation of heathens, and he denies the doctrine of eternal torments. In the course of his argument he shews that he does not on these questions stand alone, that the opinions he holds have been held at various times by men of considerable eminence in the Church. The freer thoughts of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Burnet (of the Charter-house), of Le Clerc, of Bishop Law, of Whately and of Milman, are adduced by him and pressed on the attention of the Privy Council.

Whatever may be the result of his appeal, whether the judgment to

be hereafter given will tend to open or to close the door of the Church of England on free thought, it cannot be but that good will result from the discussion of these matters. Much theological information will be widely diffused, and members of the Church will learn that opinions not far removed from those held by Unitarians have been entertained by men who have ministered acceptably at the altars of their Church, and who have been distinguished by intellectual excellence. Thus, as it often happens, persecution in its blindness defeats itself, and in the vain attempt to crush gives new circulation and power to obnoxious truths.

We will quote one passage only from this remarkable Speech. Mr. Wilson has been speaking of the opinions held in respect to future punishment by Tillotson and Le Clerc. After quoting a passage from the latter writer, in which he pleads that God can amend the imperfect characters of his children as he pleases to all eternity, in some way not revealed to us, agreeable to his goodness, he thus proceeds:

"Your Lordships will perceive the different point of view from which Tillotson and Le Clerc regarded the retributions of the world to come. Tillotson thought of the requisitions of a mere government, which would be as lenient as it could consistently with its own ends. Le Clerc considered the nature of the beings who should enter upon that future life; that if they remained human they would be capable of emendation, discipline, education; and that the ages of eternity were before them in which their Maker would carry it on. But is it becoming unlawful to reproduce a thought to be found in one of our commonest text books? Truly if the English clergyman, at the will of a party, or of any individual, is to be thrust into a Court of Law, and there confronted on one side with puerile literal senses of Articles and Liturgy, on another with judicial constructions, on another with inferences for the purpose of this case, on another with definitions of his own words which he repudiates, and on another is to find the elementary treatises of his youth and of his fathers' fathers betray his footing; then let him utter his voice of warning as far as it may be heard—'Follow me not, O youth, on the path of this ministry! Incedo per ignes suppositos cineri doloso.'"—P. 135.

We may wish to see Mr. Wilson and his companions in tribulation entirely free from the snare and bondage of subscription. We may think that a thorough, outspoken Nonconformity would better become them than their present position. On the other hand, we cannot refuse our sympathy to those who, by whatever means, are doing their best to enlarge the borders of the National Church, and to give it the privilege, which we so highly value, of free and fearless thought. It must also be remembered in their behalf that the present issue is not one of their choice. It has been forced upon them by men of narrow and bigoted views. Even if it be their purpose in the end to leave the Church if they cannot as honest men retain their place in it, they may feel it a duty first to make every effort to win for themselves and their brethren that religious liberty which they believe is the best security for truth as to doctrine and manliness as to character. In such a struggle they entitle themselves to our respect and our earnest wishes for their success.

OBITUARY.

June 25, at Hatfield Place, Bath, CLARENCE, aged 18 months; and on July 8, HOWARD, aged 3 years and 3 months, children of Mr. W. C. JOLLY.

July 1, JANE, the beloved wife of Mr. Charles COLGATE, Castle Precincts, Lewes.

July 1, Mr. SAMUEL WOOD, for 40 years superintendent teacher of the school connected with the Westgate chapel, Wakefield.

July 12, at Saffron Walden, STEPHEN LOVE, the fourth son of the late Rev. Benjamin MARTEN, of Barfrestone, Kent, aged 57 years.

July 18, aged 18 years, ELIZABETH HELEN, second daughter of Mr. William FOTHERGILL, Heathfield, Moss Side, Manchester.

July 23, in the 72nd year of his age, Mr. JOHN BOARDMAN, of Coseley.

July 24, at Sheffield, BENJAMIN JONES, youngest son of the late Rev. B. T. STANNUS, aged 18 years.

July 25, at Brincliffe, Sheffield, at the house of her brother-in-law, Chas. Alcock, Esq., Mrs. MOON, eldest daughter of Abel Drewell, Esq., late of Exeter, aged 68.

July 27, at Cheltenham, in the 73rd year of his age, JOHN CARVER, Esq., of Belmont, near Manchester. For many years, and up to the time of his death, he held the office of treasurer to the Cross-Street congregation, the duties of which he discharged with great care and fidelity. His character was such as secured for him the respect not only of his fellow-worshipers, but of his fellow-citizens of every sect and party.

July 29, aged 52, ANN, wife of Mr. Thos. OTLEY, metal manufacturer, New Meadow Street, Sheffield.

July 30, at the residence of her brother-in-law, Richard Allen, Esq., Bathwick Hill, Bath, ANN, the second daughter of the late Richard TURNER, Esq., of Warrington.

July 31, at Leicester, Mr. ROBERT MARSHALL, of that place, in the 78th year of his age.

Aug. 3, at Hough Green, Chester, FLORENCE MARY, infant daughter of John H. GREENE, Esq.

Aug. 7, at Clifton, ANNE, widow of the late Harry HUNT, Esq., of Edgbaston, aged 73.

Aug. 11, EBENEZER, son of Mr. William CADMAN, of Mosley Terrace, Queen's Park, Manchester.

Aug. 15, at Allerton Priory, Liverpool, aged 66, Mr. THEODORE W. RATHBONE.

Aug. 15, at Leeds, after a long illness, Mrs. ELEANOR A. CHARLTON, in the 22nd year of her age.

MARRIAGES.

July 4, at Little Portland-Street chapel, by Rev. Charles Beard, B.A., HENRY ENFIELD ROSCOE, Esq., F.R.S., of Manchester, to LUCY, youngest daughter of Edmund POTTER, Esq., M.P., F.R.S., of 22, Princes Gardens, Kensington.

July 8, at the New meeting-house, Kidderminster, by Rev. D. Maginnis, of Stourbridge, Mr. BENJAMIN COLEMAN, of Liverpool, to SARAH, daughter of Mr. Benjamin STORKE, Kidderminster.

July 18, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. BENJAMIN JERRARD to SARAH ANN, daughter of Mr. Nathan WARDLE, of Kearsley.

July 29, at George's chapel, Exeter, by Rev. T. L. Marshall, of Brixton, Rev. J. C. STREET, of Manchester, to LAURA JANE, daughter of Mr. Jas. STEPHENS, of Exeter.

July 30, at the Unitarian chapel, Newchurch, by Rev. Wm. Elliott, Mr. ALFRED ASHWORTH to Miss DINAH HOWORTH.

Aug. 5, at the Great Meeting, Leicester, by Rev. C. C. Coe, EDWIN CLEPHAN, Esq., of the High Street, to LOUISA, only daughter of the late George WITHERS, Esq., of Colney Street, Herts.

Aug. 8, at Gee-Cross chapel, by Rev. Chas. Beard, B.A., RUPERT POTTER, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, barrister-at-law, second son of Edmund Potter, Esq., M.P., F.R.S., to HELEN, youngest daughter of the late John LEECH, Esq., of Palace Gardens, Kensington, and Gorse Hall, Stalybridge.